

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management :

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*  
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*  
L. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*  
Prof. R. S. CONWAY, *Litt.D., F.B.A.* With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.  
E. A. BARBER, M.A., *representing the Oxford Philological Society.*  
Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., *representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*  
With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. BAND, *Harvard University*, and Prof. W. RITCHIE, *University of Cape Town.*

Vol. XLIV

FEBRUARY, 1930

No. I

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS .. .. .	I	REVIEWS (continued) :	
THE TWO-THOUSANDTH ANNIVERSARY OF VIRGIL'S BIRTH. J. K. FOTHERINGHAM ..	1	<i>The Works of Aristotle</i> , I., VII. (Ross, etc.) ;	
SVM PIVS AENEAS. W. B. ANDERSON ..	3	<i>Aristotle : Selections</i> (Ross). J. L. STOCKS ..	20
VERGIL, AENEID VI. 567-569. W. F. J. KNIGHT ..	5	<i>Das Haus des Herodes</i> (Willrich). E. R. BEVAN ..	22
PITCH ACCENT AND METRICAL STRESS. GILBERT MURRAY ..	5	<i>Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue latine</i> (Meillet). R. L. TURNER ..	23
AGAIN THE <i>Bacchae</i> . W. B. SEDGWICK ..	6	<i>Die Responsion in den Plantinischen Cantica</i> (Crusius). W. BEARE ..	24
A THEOCRITICAN CRUX. A. S. F. GOW ..	9	<i>Ciceroniana</i> . T. B. L. WEBSTER ..	25
NOTE ON PETRONIUS' <i>Satyricon</i> 135. I. M. GARRIDO ..	10	<i>Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age</i> (Conway). R. A. B. MYNORS ..	29
PLAUTUS, <i>Menaechmi</i> , III. iii. 2. H. D. BROADHEAD ..	12	<i>Sexti Properti quae supersunt omnia</i> (Richmond). H. STEWART ..	30
<i>Oratio obliqua</i> —Future perfect indicative in conditional clauses in primary sequence. J. T. MUIR ..	12	<i>Caesaris Augusti Imperatoris Operum Fragmenta</i> (Malcovati). M. P. CHARLESWORTH ..	33
REVIEWS :		<i>Latin Grammar</i> (Elmer). W. E. P. PANTIN ..	34
<i>Geschichte der griechischen Literatur</i> , I. (Schmidt-Stählin). T. A. SINCLAIR ..	12	<i>Suidae Lexicon</i> , I. (Adler). H. STUART JONES ..	37
<i>Sparta</i> (Bölte, etc.). H. T. WADE-GERY ..	14	<i>A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury</i> (Baynes), etc. W. E. HEITLAND ..	38
<i>Euripidis Cantica</i> (Schroeder). G. MURRAY ..	16	SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	40
<i>Platons Verhältnis zur Mathematik</i> (Demel). A. E. TAYLOR ..	17	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. .. .	45
<i>Aristotelis Politica</i> (Immisch). E. S. FORSTER ..	19	BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	47

LONDON : JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.  
NEW YORK : G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 1, Linton Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. W. J. Cuttle, M.A., The University, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, University College, W.C. 1; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Mrs. Jackson, The Cottage, Cordwell Valley, Holmesfield, Nr. Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. M. Towne, County School for Girls, Beckenham; Mr. T. B. L. Webster, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford; Miss W. A. Odell, Brighton and Hove High School for Girls, Brighton; Miss M. K. Norris, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Mr. C. W. Baty, 49, Waterloo Road, Bedford; and Mr. J. E. Scott, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

## DEIGMA

A FIRST GREEK BOOK. By Professors Walters and Conway, with the co-operation of Miss Constance I. Daniel, M.A. 4s. 6d.

SECOND AND REVISED EDITION. With a Summary of Accidence by R. B. Lattimer, M.A., which has been included to enable students of average ability to dispense with the use of a separate grammar. The chief objects of the authors are to bring the pupil as soon as possible to the stage of reading Greek authors; and therefore to present the most important uses in Syntax side by side with the most important part of Accidence; and to use the chief results of recent inquiry in Historical Grammar, so as to simplify and enliven the harder forms of Accidence and rules of Syntax by indicating briefly how they grew up.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

## A CLASSICAL DICTIONARY

OF  
GREEK & ROMAN BIOGRAPHY  
MYTHOLOGY & GEOGRAPHY

Compiled from Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionaries, Revised by G. E. Marindin, M.A. With over 800 woodcuts. Demy 8vo. 27s. net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1

## A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK & ROMAN ANTIQUITIES

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and incorporating the results of modern research. Edited by F. Warre Cornish, M.A. 25s. net

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1

and  
upon  
ional  
c) to  
reate

annual  
f 5s.  
dings  
ssical  
ssical  
efore  
must

the  
ither  
oad,  
etary  
sity,  
am ;  
rsity  
Basil  
Miss  
haw,  
Mrs.  
O. T.  
lege,  
Mr.  
a and  
lege,  
r, 49,  
lege,

e  
d.

r,  
ne  
as  
st  
to  
en  
p.

N

1





# The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1930

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE Classical Association met at University College, London, on January 3 and 4. The *Classical Review* hopes to publish in May an account of that meeting, and of the General Meeting to be held at Hull University College on April 8-11.

From 1880 to 1928 Dr. Maurice Hutton was Professor of Greek in the University of Toronto. To mark his retirement from this office, and from the Principalship of University College, Toronto, his past students have written and compiled a history of the Honour Classical Course in the University of Toronto. This book (published by the University of Toronto Press in 1929) is both a notable compliment to the fine scholar in whose honour it is written,

and a valuable contribution to the history of classical education. Toronto has throughout clung to an ideal of classical education which is essentially British, and has been justified in the distinguished list of Honour Classical Graduates with which the volume closes. All classical professors, and especially those whose work lies in Universities where the backing of long tradition fails, will find this book both inspiring and instructive.

Mr. A. Feldmann and Mr. W. Siegfried (Hofstrasse 52, Zürich 7) ask us to announce, in the interests of others who may be thinking of the same service to scholarship, that they are at work upon an Index Verborum to Polybius.

### THE TWO-THOUSANDTH ANNIVERSARY OF VIRGIL'S BIRTH.

I CANNOT find that there has been any doubt among modern scholars as to the year of Virgil's birth or as to its date in the Roman calendar of the time. He was born on the Ides of October in 70 B.C. In reckoning intervals from dates B.C. to dates A.D., it must always be borne in mind that there was no year 0. A.D. 1 follows directly on 1 B.C. Therefore, while the 69th anniversary of Virgil's birth fell in 1 B.C., the 70th fell in A.D. 1, and the 2,000th, or 1,930 + 70th, will fall in A.D. 1 + 1,930—that is, in A.D. 1931. I think we should not attempt to convert Virgil's birthday from the unreformed calendar to that which we now use. He was born on October 15 of the official calendar of the time, and, if we are to celebrate the 2,000th anniversary, it should be on October 15 of the official calendar of our time—i.e. on Thursday, October 15, 1931.

In case anyone should wish to call the date of Virgil's birth in question, I have endeavoured to make an exhaus-

NO. CCCXXIV. VOL. XLIV.

sive study of the ancient authorities. I believe I have collected here every reference to the year of his birth, the year of his death, and his age at death. I use the most recent edition in each case.

(1) I begin with the epitome of his life, prefixed to the epitome of the commentary of *Probus* on the Eclogues and Georgics. See Janell's edition, apud P. Vergilii Maronis Opera (Teubner, 1920), p. xxiii:

P. Vergilius Maro natus Idibus Octobris Crasso et Pompeio consulibus matre Magia Polla, patre Vergilio rustico uico Andico, qui abest a Mantua milia passuum XXX, tenui facultate nutritus . . .

Decessit in Calabria annum agens quinquagesimum et primum heredibus Augusto et Maecenate cum Proculo minore fratre.

(2) *Phlegon*, ed. Keller — *Rerum Naturalium Scriptores Graeci Minores*, I. (Teubner, 1877), p. 100:

Under Ol. 177, 3 (= 70-69 B.C.):

Καὶ Οὐεργίλιος Μάρων ὁ ποιητὴς ἐγεννήθη τούτου τοῦ ἔτους εἰδοῖς Ὀκτωβρίαις.

(3) *Vergilii Vita Donatiana*, ed. Janell, ubi supra, p. xii:

§ 2. Natus est Cn. Pompeio Magno M. Licinio Crasso primum coss. Iduum Octobrium die in pago, qui Andes dicitur et abest a Mantua non procul.

§ 35 (p. xv). Anno aetatis quinquagesimo secundo inpositurus Aeneidi summam manum statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere, triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare, ut reliqua uita tantum philosophiae uacaret. Sed cum ingressus iter Athenis occurrisset Augusto ab oriente Romam reuertenti destinaretque non absistere atque etiam una redire, dum Megara uicinum oppidum feruentissimo sole cognoscit, languorem nactus est eumque non intermissa nauigatione auxit ita, ut grauior aliquanto Brundisium appelleret, ubi diebus paucis obiit XI Kal. Octobr. Cn. Sentio Q. Lucretio coss.

(4) *Hieronymus*, *Chronici Canones*, ed. Fotheringham (1923), pp. 234, 235 (Ad Ol. 177, 3 = Ptolomei ann. XI):

Vergilius Maro in pago qui Andes dicitur haut procul a Mantua nascitur Pompeio et Crasso consulibus. (The MS. evidence is strongly against the insertion of the words 'idibus octobribus'.)

P. 247 (Ad Ol. 190, 3 = Augusti ann. XXVI):

Vergilius Brundisii moritur Sentio Saturnino et Lucretio Cinna consulibus.

(4a) *Prosper Tiro*, *Epitoma Chronicon*, ed. Mommsen, *Monumenta Germaniae Hist.*, *Auctores Antiquissimi*, Vol. IX., *Chronica Minora*, I. (1892), p. 404:

Decimo autem Ptholomei regnantis anno Vergilius Maro in pago qui Andes dicitur iuxta Mantuam nascitur Pompeio et Crasso cons. s.

P. 407. Eiusdem imperii anno XXV Vergilius Brundisii moritur [Saturnino Cinna consulibus] et Neapoli secundo a ciuitate miliario sepelitur. (Cod. V omits 'Eiusdem . . . XXV,' but contains 'Sat. . . consulibus.' Codd. MAL contain 'Eiusdem . . . XXV,' but omit 'Sat. . . consulibus.' Codd. XC of Hieronymus, to which Prosper is most closely allied, place the former of these entries against the tenth year of Ptolomeus (or Ptolemaeus), and the second against the twenty-fifth year of Augustus.)

(4b) *Chronica Gallica* a. DXI, ed. Mommsen, ubi supra, p. 638:

Vergilius nascitur Pompeio et Crasso consulibus.

(4c) *Beda*, *Chronica Maiora*, ed. Mommsen, M.G.H., A.A. XIII, *Chronica Minora*, III. (1895), p. 280:

Vergilius Maro in pago, qui Andes dicitur, haut procul a Mantua nascitur Pompeio et Crasso consulibus.

(5) *Philargyrius*, *Vita Vergilii I.*, *Vitae Vergilianae*, ed. Brummer (Teubner, 1912), p. 40:

. . . natus est sub Gneio Pompeio Magno et Marco Licinio Crasso consule, iduum octauo die in pago qui Andes dicitur haut procul a Mantua.

P. 44. Virgilius anno Augusti uicesimo quinto Brundisi moritur Sentio Saturnino et Lucretio Cinna consulibus.

(6) *Philargyrius*, *Vita Vergilii II.*, *ibid.*, p. 48:

Vergilius Maro in pago qui Andes dicitur haut procul a Mantua nascitur Pompeio et Crasso consulibus. Virgilius Brundisi moritur XI k. Oct. Sentio Saturnino et Lucretio Cinna consulibus nono Ptolomaei regis anno, cui apud Aegyptum Cleopatra in regnum successit, Augusti Caesaris XXVI regni anno, ante annos XVI Christi natiuitatis.

(7) *Focae grammatici urbis Romae Vita Vergilii*, *ibid.*, pp. 50, 51:

consule Pompeio uitalibus editus auris et Crasso tetigit terras quo tempore Chelas iam mitis Phaethon post Virginis ora receptat.

(8) *Vergilii Vita Noricensis*, *ibid.*, pp. 54, 55:

Eusebius dicit: Virgilius Maro in pago qui Andes dicitur haut procul a Mantua nascitur Pompeio et Crasso consulibus. . . Virgilius in Brundisi moritur Sentio Saturnino et Lucretio Cinna consulibus. . . Puplius Virgilius Maro natus est in idibus Octobris Pompeio et Crasso consulibus genere Tusco, Mantuae ciuitatis uico Andes nomine ubi eum mater Maia genuit ante triennium quam Lucretius poeta deciderat.

(9) *Vergilii Vita Monacensis*, *ibid.*, p. 56:

Pompeio et Crasso consulibus.

Pompeio et Crasso consulibus anno Ptholemei regis Aegypti octauo in pago Andensi in uilla quae Andis dicitur iuxta Mantuam nascitur Virgilius, quem alii de Romanis alii de Mantuanis parentibus natum autumant, infimis tamen, quia pater illius figulus fuit Istimicon nomine.

(10) *Vergilii Vita Gudiana II.*, *ibid.*, p. 62:

uita Virgilii poetae incipit:

Virgilius genere Mantuanus in pago, qui Andis dicitur, haut procul a Mantua nascitur Pompeio et Crasso consulibus.

(11) *Vergilii Vita Bernensis*, *ibid.*, p. 66:

Publius Virgilius Maro, genere Mantuanus, dignitate eques Romanus, natus idibus Octobribus Gneo Pompeio et M. Crasso consulibus . . .

Vixit annos LII amicitia usus imperatoris Augusti et aliorum complurium probatissimorum uiuorum.

(12) *Julianus*, Anthologia Latina 560, ed. Riese, Pars 1, fasc. 2 (1906), pp. 73, 74:

Qui pastorali peragrauit Maenala Musa  
Ruraque et Aeneae concinit arma Maro,  
Ille decem lustris geminos postquam addidit  
annos,  
Concessit fatis et situs hoc tumulo est.

(13) *Maximinus*, A.L. 566, *ibid.*, p. 75:  
Iamque ad lustra decem Titan accesserat alter,  
Cum tibi me rapuit, Mantua, Parthenope.

(14) *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. Mommsen, Chron. Min. I. (1891), p. 215. Full text in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, 92 (1865), p. 452 (Ad annum 9 Ptolemaei):

ἵπ. Ὀρηνσίου καὶ Μετέλλου . . .  
Βιργίλιος ἐγεννήθη.

(15) *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, ed. Mommsen, *ibid.*:

Hortensio et Metello (69 B.C.).

His cons. natus est Vergilius die id. Oct.

P. 218. duobus Lentulis (18 B.C.)

His cons. obiit Vergilius die XI kal. Oct.

It is commonly supposed that, with the exception of Probus, all these documents derive their information directly or indirectly from Suetonius, who, however, is never mentioned. It seems clear that Hieronymus (Jerome) was used by several of these writers, though there are very few that appear to depend on Jerome alone.

Apart from the *Chronicon Paschale* and the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, the consuls of the year of birth, if given at all, are those of 70 B.C. With the exception of the *Cons. Constant.*, each

authority that names the consuls of the year of death names those of 19 B.C., and the incidents recorded in the *Vita Donatiana* certainly belong to 19 B.C.

Probus or his epitomist makes Virgil die in his 51st year; but the number 52 occurs in the *Vita Donatiana*, the *Vita Bernensis*, Julianus, and Maximinus. The pairs of consuls named by Jerome as by other writers, except the *Chronicon Paschale* and *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, are 51 years apart, but Jerome actually places the birth and death 52 years apart in his chronological framework. It seems to me probable that Suetonius wrote 'quinguesimo secundo.' He probably obtained this figure by counting inclusively all the years from the first consulship of Pompey and Crassus to the consulship of Cn. Sentius and Q. Lucretius; but since Virgil died 24 days before his birthday, he had not really completed his 51st year.

I could conceive of somebody holding that the number 52 is correct, and placing Virgil's birth in 71 B.C. I could not conceive of anybody placing that birth in 69 B.C. with the *Chronicon Paschale* and *Consularia Constantinopolitana*. But when Probus and Suetonius appear to agree on the first consulship of Pompey and Crassus, and are supported by Phlegon, who may be independent, we cannot well set that date aside because Suetonius without support from independent sources places Virgil's death in his 52nd year.

J. K. FOTHERINGHAM.

#### SVM PIVS AENEAS.

It is unnecessary to mention that the sentence at the head of this paper (*Aen.* I. 378) has been an easy target for the scoffer. Even the most ardent Virgilians shake their heads over it and mutter something about the naïve Homeric tradition. The following remarks seek to maintain the heretical thesis that the words in question are not only defensible but admirable.

Virgil has taken great pains to show us the state of mind—and even of body—in which Aeneas found himself at the stage of his adventures recorded in the

early part of Book I. The wrath of Juno has dogged the Trojan wanderers for many years and balked their hopes of reaching Italy (vv. 29-32); but now, as they leave Sicily and the island recedes from their sight, the promised land seems at last within reach, *laeti et spumas salis aere ruebant* (35). But their joy is short-lived. The *memor Iunonis ira* brings upon them a terrific storm. Aeneas is in despair, and wishes he were dead (92-101). His wild words (*talìa iactanti*) are scarcely out of his mouth when a great blast

strikes his sail and the fury of wind and wave works havoc among his ships. When Neptune at last calms the waters Aeneas and the poor remnant of his followers, all utterly wearied (157), make for the nearest shore, and succeed in reaching the African coast:

magno telluris amore  
egressi optata potiuntur Troes harena  
et sale tabentis artus in litore ponunt. (171 ff.)

While his followers are lighting fires and attempting to dry and prepare the soaked corn, Aeneas ascends a high rock in the faint hope that he may espy one of the missing ships, but in vain. The sight of some stags suggests the advisability of providing food for his men, and he shoots seven, one for each ship. Returning to his followers, he seeks to encourage them in the famous words *O socii*, etc. (198-207), reminding them of their promised destiny. But only his lips have spoken (*talìa uoce referi*); his hopefulness is assumed and his talk of destiny is hollow; he himself has lost his faith and is a prey to despair (208 f.). Wearied though he is, he passes a sleepless night, and at the first streak of dawn he goes out with Achates to reconnoitre the region. Venus meets him; she is disguised as a huntress, but Aeneas feels that he is in the presence of a divine being (*O dea certe*), and he appeals to her for help and also for information as to the land in which he has sought refuge. Venus, after disclaiming divinity, tells the story of Dido and Carthage and ends by asking:

sed uos qui tandem, quibus aut uenistis ab oris,  
quoue tenetis iter? (369 f.)

Aeneas begins his reply with *O dea*. He still believes that he is talking to a goddess. Servius calls attention to this, and it must be carefully borne in mind. 'We have come from Troy,' he says,

si uestras forte per auris  
Troiae nomen iit.

*Vestras* seems always to be interpreted as meaning 'of you denizens of this land.' If this be so, Aeneas seems to regard Venus as a local divinity and links her in his address with the human

inhabitants. But the word may well mean 'of you gods and goddesses,' in which case there is a world of bitter irony in the clause *si uestras . . . iit*. Be that as it may, the rest of the passage contains an agonised protest against the conduct of the gods from a man whose faith and courage have broken under an intolerable strain. *Forte sua* (377) might be said to strike the keynote: the Trojans, he says, have been left a prey to the blind caprice of wind and waves. Then he gives rein to the bitterness of his soul. 'I am, forsooth, the Aeneas who is famed as *pius*, the man who rescued the Penates from the foe and carried them away with me; I am descended from the sovereign god Jupiter; a goddess, my mother, pointed out the way to me, and I faithfully followed the oracular behests that the gods sent me. And what is the result?—here I am with only seven ships surviving, a needy stranger wandering over Libyan wastes!'

Thus the speech of Aeneas, addressed to one whom he recognises as a goddess, cries out against the gods for leading him on with instructions and promises and then abandoning him, in spite of his devotion to them and to their commands. *Sum pius Aeneas* is not a piece of smug complacency; it is a poignant cry wrung from a tortured heart. *Hic pietatis honos?* asks Venus in complaining to Jupiter of her son's afflictions (v. 153). The same thought is expressed with added pathos in *sum pius Aeneas*. One may mention in conclusion that Venus understands her son's feelings perfectly. The first words of her reply (uttered still in her assumed character of a mortal) assure him that the gods have not turned their faces from him, as he was tempted to think (387 f.).<sup>1</sup>

W. B. ANDERSON.

<sup>1</sup> Another place where *pius Aeneas* is generally found unbearable is *Aen.* IV. 393, at *pius Aeneas* . . . I hope to deal with this and with some allied passages on a future occasion; on the present occasion I would merely observe that if certain critics of *at pius Aeneas* had given due attention to the rest of the sentence instead of harking back to the previous paragraph, they would perhaps have seen reason to modify their strictures.



## VERGIL, AENEID VI. 567-569.

castigatque auditque dolos, subigitque fateri  
quae quis apud superos, furto laetatus inani,  
distulit in seram commissa piacula mortem.

IN C.R. XXVII. 229 Professor E. W. Cornwall writes: 'Page, rightly objecting to Conington and others that you cannot "delay crimes committed," translates "and compels confession wherever anyone has delayed to late death the due atonement." But if *piacula* = atonements, the only possible translation is "and compels them to confess those atonements which anyone has delayed," etc., and you cannot "confess atonements."'

He then proceeds to support by parallels the rendering 'and compels them to confess the crimes, the atonements for which anyone has delayed,' etc.: which depends on the possibility that *piacula*, as object to *fateri*, can mean 'things to be atoned,' and, as object to *distulit*, 'atonements.'

I should like to suggest another way of understanding the sentence, which does not indeed conflict seriously with the rendering of which Professor Cornwall approves, but which seems to follow more closely the subtlety of the Vergilian 'transference' and economy, of which our passage is a good example. I propose that:

1. *commissa* (as often, perhaps as normally) means something more like 'risked' than any other English word: as in phrases like Cicero's *committre in conclave* (of a murderer, *Pro R. Am.* XXIII. 64), or Livy's *committre se in aequiorem locum*: with here the moral connotation of ὁφειλάειν;

2. *distulit commissa piacula* does not mean in English 'has postponed risked atonements,' but 'has risked atonements and has postponed them': or rather, with *quae quis*, 'what atonements anyone has risked and postponed': which is another way of saying (since ll. 568, 9 are object to *fateri*: is *distulit* indicative in indirect question, as *stant* in *Aen.* VI. 779, and, if the reading is right, *laetantur* in *Ec.* IV. 52?) that he has risked atonements and that he has postponed them, and what they are (and hence also what the crimes were);

3. Livy, in Professor Cornwall's excellent parallels, as in other usages, is influenced by Vergil (as Tacitus was) and extends his practice. To the occurrences of verse in Livy collected by A. A. Brodribb (*C.R.* XXIV. 13) I would add 'Fabii . . . unius familiae  
uiribus Veienti populo pestem minitantes' (II. 49)—surely a line of Ennius incorporated without change.

I should have thought my suggestion too trivial to offer, if I had not believed that it might help to make clear Vergil's habitual way of saving words. My general view is that he does not wrench and distort language, but exploits to the most for the sake of compression the nature of Latin thought-form.

## Additional Note.

Professor R. S. Conway, to whom this note has been shown, kindly adds the suggestion that there is a closer fusion of participle and noun than I admit: that this fusion is a regular idiom, and that *commissa piacula* = 'the duty (or risk) of having to make expiation.' He further adds that this makes my proposal to take *distulit* as an example of the indicative in indirect question unnecessary, and that the other cases, after *viden' ut*, are different.

I am grateful for the comment and very ready to recognise this close fusion of participle and noun, which is almost essential to my view. I agree that it is by no means necessary to take *distulit* as in indirect question; but I still think that this shading into one another of the syntactical forms, *quid distulerit* and *id quod distulit*, in my belief possible to Vergil, contributes to the right understanding of the passage.

Otherwise I am glad to find that Professor Conway has himself always taken the words as I propose to take them.

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

Bloxham School.

## PITCH ACCENT AND METRICAL STRESS.

MR. DALE, in his interesting article on *Accents and the Greek Iambic Line* (*C.R.* XLIII. 1929, p. 165), has, I must confess, convicted me of some exaggeration. I was discussing how

various tribrachs and in particular the word *πατέρα* is treated in Greek iambs. The argument was as follows. The tribrach must be treated either as a trochee or as an iambus. Now (1) if



the pitch-accent on the second syllable of *πατέρα* had any metrical value we should expect the iambic scansion to be most frequent; (2) if there was a slight stress on the first syllable, as in the current English or Latin pronunciation, the trochaic scansion should be most frequent; (3) if there was no stress at all, both scansions should be equally common. I said (*Classical Tradition in Poetry*, p. 85) that the trochaic scansion was 'very common'—which is true—and the iambic 'very rare'—which is an exaggeration.

Mr. Dale shows that in Sophocles the two uses are practically equal; trochees 10, iambs 9. Elsewhere, however, the disproportion is marked: in Aeschylus it is 7 to 2, in the *Index Tragicus* to the fragments 6 to 1. For Euripides I fear I have no statistics, but Mr. E. Harrison has very kindly sent me those for all the plays except *Cyclops* and *Rhesus*. The result is trochees 42, iambs 22, or about 2 to 1. It is noteworthy that of the iambs no less than 17 are in the first foot, where metrical varieties are most common and where, for example, in English blank verse a trochee very frequently takes the place of an iambus. Of course, however, the mere mechanics of metrical convenience must count for a good deal.

The Aristophanes figures are interesting. At first sight they are 13 to 8, but on examination we find that 5 of the 8 occur in one short passage, *Birds* 1350-1364, where a deliberate effect is made by repeating the same words in the same rhythm several times. It would therefore, perhaps, give a truer picture of the case to count the whole passage as one and make the proportion 13 to 4. (If, as I think, the rhythm was slightly unusual the effect would be heightened.)

The frequency of the iambic *πατέρα* in Sophocles is curious. Four of the nine cases are accounted for by the formula *πατέρα τὸν ἄμῶν*: two more by the juxtaposition *πατήρ πατέρα, πατέρα πατήρ*. I should be inclined, on the whole, to believe that (1) the trochaic scansion was decidedly the more usual and therefore probably nearer to the normal pronunciation, but (2) the preference was so slight that it could readily be dropped for almost any good motive—e.g. for rhetorical antithesis (*πατέρα πατήρ*), for a convenient poetic formula (*πατέρα τὸν ἄμῶν*), or of course for the sort of emphasis that comes from a slightly unusual rhythm (*Birds* 1350 ff.; cf. *ib.* 757).

*Πατέρα* happens to be a useful tribrach for this purpose because it is paroxytone.

GILBERT MURRAY.

#### AGAIN THE BACCHAE.

I HAVE sometimes wondered whether the problem of the *Bacchae* may not be more imaginary than real. It may perhaps help to throw light on the question if we start, not with the play as we now have it, but with the idea of the play as it might present itself to the poet's mind.

Euripides had been living in Macedonia, and critics are no doubt right in supposing that his experiences there first suggested the idea of a play which should deal with the worship of Dionysus. The choice lay between the story of Pentheus and that of Lycurgus (both treated of by Aeschylus): having decided on Pentheus, Euripides could not avoid following the main outlines of the myth. This necessitated a plot containing—

1. The arrival of Dionysus and the introduction of his rites;
2. Opposition to them, with a presentation of the points for and against;
3. Confronting of Dionysus and Pentheus;
4. The folly and death of Pentheus; and,
5. Almost inevitably, choral odes describing the religious experience of the worshippers.

Now this, and nothing but this, is what the play contains. Nowhere has Euripides gone out of his way to introduce controversial matter: he simply follows tragic routine. Pentheus is the typical Aristotelian hero—a good man who meets with a dreadful doom through some *ἀμαρτία*. This comes

about in the traditional way by the action of *ἔβρις*. But this necessarily implies that Pentheus will be cruelly treated by the god, and it is just this cruelty of the god which is the stumbling-block to so many readers. Still this is inherent in the conception of the working of *ἄρη*. The difficulty is that here the god, contrary to the usual practice, appears personally instead of employing human agency. We have not the vague cruelty of 'God,' 'the gods,' or 'Fate,' but the actual unfolding, step by step, of the god's purpose, and the gradual progress of the victim to his doom.

But in all this we need not assume any malicious intent of Euripides: it is only the natural corollary of the ordinary Greek view of the gods. It is noteworthy that the gods in action in Greek literature usually act much more reprehensibly than human beings. We need not go to the 'rationalist' Euripides to see this, nor to the 'unpopular' Dorian Apollo. The cruelty of the vengeance in the *Odyssey* is chargeable to Athene rather than to Odysseus. It is Athene again who deludes and tramples on the fallen Ajax in the play of the respectable Sophocles (precisely like Dionysus in the *Bacchae*). But a Greek would not have seen anything unworthy in this. It is only by importing our own ideas of fair play that we find anything reprehensible in the idea of exacting vengeance on a (private) enemy to the utmost farthing. The gods, being stronger than men, can enjoy a more complete triumph (cf. *Ajax*, l. 118: *ὅρῳ, Ὀδυσσεῦ, τὴν θεῶν ἰσχὺν ὄσση*).

Much of the difficulty of the play is further due to the disconcerting Greek (Athenian?) habit of stating both sides of a moral question, even to the length of brutality, as notoriously in Thucydides, and in the many wrangling scenes of Greek tragedy (for instance, Admetus appears to us in the *Alcestis* in a far worse light than Euripides intended). Again, a poet is apt to be led by the dramatic possibilities of a scene to lengths and effects which originally he never quite intended: so, in his sympathetic interest in portraying the character of Dido, Virgil, to some

extent at least, forgot that she was to be the villain of the piece; and so here Euripides, in the rapid play of dialogue, is something more than fair to Pentheus, and less than fair to Dionysus.

The play is an interesting illustration of the working of the Greek mind: it is intellectually as much superior to an ordinary modern play as it is morally inferior. An English dramatist would have taken sides: the Greek gives both sides impartially. With regard to the idea of fair play we must not lose sight of the fact that the myth itself was intended to glorify Dionysus, and that Euripides simply took the story as he found it. There is just one line of criticism in the play: *ὁργὰς πρέπει θεοῦς οὐχ ὁμοιοῦσθαι βροτοῖς* (l. 1348): the reply is simply *πάσαι τάδε Ζεὺς οὐμὸς ἐπένευσεν πατὴρ*. There is no reason to suppose the audience would feel any moral scruples.<sup>1</sup>

But Euripides, if not condemning Dionysus, is not, I think, commending him: his attitude to the god, if not critical, is at any rate non-committal. But with regard to the worshippers his attitude is quite different. The choral odes throughout stress the beauty and purity of the worship. This part of the play is surely based on the poet's own experience: Euripides had seen the strange exaltation of the Bacchantes in Macedonia, and recognised it as something supernatural and of moral value. There is no reason whatever to think he condemned it. It is true that the obvious criticisms of *παννυχίδες* are brought forward, as indeed they were bound to be; but they are sufficiently answered, as far as the Bacchantes are concerned, by every utterance of theirs from beginning to end of the play. As a matter of fact, Euripides is not in the habit of attacking religion: he only, like all thinking men of his day, attacks, or rather discredits by implication, immoral myths and degrading superstitions. It is in this that he is a rationalist, like Plato. The quarrel of his contemporaries with him was for introducing a jarring element into tragedy.

The keynote of the choral odes as a

<sup>1</sup> Dionysus describes himself as *ἡπιότατος* in l. 861.

whole I take to be a glorification of the natural life, as exemplified *in this case* by the 'return to Nature' of the worshippers of Dionysus, with their simple creed (hence the references to the folly of Wisdom and the futility of Philosophers). This is different, indeed, from what we get elsewhere in Euripides, but by no means opposed to it; and assuming that odes were to be sung by the chorus at all, it is difficult to see what theme could be more appropriate or effective: it was perfectly natural for the poet's thoughts to have turned in the direction they did. Perhaps, however, some distinction may be drawn; I personally feel that the attacks on free-thought are spoken rather more 'in character,' while the passages showing religious feeling and love of nature are more expressive of the poet's own views, though not necessarily his *feelings*, since they are here bound up so closely with Bacchic inspiration. We have here Euripides' *L'Allegro*. I would take the much discussed lines 402-431 at their face value: expressed in plain Greek they mean that the unbending puritan is *ἀνὴρ ἀναφρόδιτος, ἄμουνος* and a *ὑδροπότης*. It is only what was more briefly expressed by Martin Luther: 'Wer nicht liebt Weib, Wein und Gesang, der bleibt ein Narr sein Leben lang.'

Another case where critics may have created difficulties where the audience saw none is the second half of the speech of Tiresias, especially lines 286-297. I suspect that many of the audience had heard very similar speeches from Sophists or their followers and admired them. If it were put into prose, it might have come straight from the *Gorgias* or *Protagoras*. As an answer to Pentheus it seems to us singularly unconvincing, but that Euripides did not intend such an effect is shown by lines 314-318—a flimsy argument, which, however, every word of the chorus shows to be seriously meant. Euripides certainly did not intend to

leave in our minds a lurking suspicion of the chastity of the Bacchantes.

This is not to say that Euripides would necessarily himself have used these arguments. It is, I think, a habit of the Greek mind to play speculatively around an idea, to try out possible arguments, and to accept tentative solutions. It is this which makes much of Plato hard to follow. One is constantly asking oneself whether Plato can really have been satisfied with the purely verbal arguments which so often meet us. His answer, I think, would be that such arguments are right enough as far as they go, and necessary in dialectic, but by no means conclusive. Such a refutation of Thrasymachus, for instance, is the preliminary to the full discussion in the *Republic*.

So in the *Bacchae*; I would suggest that Tiresias' arguments, though not necessarily intended to be convincing, are at least suggestions as to how Pentheus' criticisms may be met; but the full answer to them is to be found in the play as a whole. I feel, however, that the audience would have applauded Tiresias' speech as a clever *ἐπίδειξις*—not excluding even lines 286-297:<sup>1</sup> it was probably not the first time they had heard such etymological rationalisation. The arguments are at any rate no worse than Apollo's in the *Eumenides*, and the weakness for etymology can be illustrated from the *Cratylus*.

I would therefore suggest that the play is no 'problem play,' is neither recantation nor apologia, that it contains nothing outside the ordinary practice of Greek drama, and that to the audience no special difficulty would present itself. W. B. SEDGWICK.

<sup>1</sup> I accept Sandys' translation of 292-4. I am not so sure of my Greek as to deny that *ρήξας μέρος τι τοῦ αἵθερος* can possibly mean *ἀπορρήξας τι τοῦ αἵθερος*. I would read *ραφήναι* in 295, as *ἐνεργήσῃ* in 286 implies some further mention of stitching, and the coincidence *τραφήναι: ραφήναι* is too striking to be accidental. *τραφήναι* would be an obvious error for a careless scribe.

## A THEOCRITICAN CRUX.

## 1. 45 ff:

τυτθὸν δ' ὅσον ἔπαιον ἀλιτροῖο γέροντος  
 πυρναλαῖς σταφυλαῖσι καλὸν βέβριθεν ἀλωά,  
 τὰν ὀλίγος τις κῶρος ἐφ' αἰμασίαισι φυλάσσει  
 ἡμενος· ἀμφὶ δὲ νιν δού' ἀλώπεκες ἀ μὲν ἀν' ὄρχωσι  
 φοιτῇ σινομένα τὰν τρώξιμον, ἀ δ' ἐπὶ πύρρῃ  
 πάντα δόλον τεύχουσα τὸ παιδίον οὐ πρὶν ἀνησεῖν  
 φατὶ πρὶν ἢ ἀκράτιστον ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι καθίξῃ.

THE verb ἀκρατίζεσθαι means properly 'to take the first breakfast': ὁ ἡμεῖς ἀκρατισμόν καλοῦμεν διὰ τὸ ἐν ἀκράτῳ βρέχειν καὶ προσέσθαι ψωμούς (Athen. I. 11c). One scholiast on our passage seems to have read ἀκρατισμόν (or some case of that noun at any rate); the others agree with the MSS. in reading ἀκράτιστον, which, with a change of accent, should be the verbal adjective. We have, therefore, a choice between a noun meaning (roughly) 'breakfast' and an adjective meaning 'breakfasted' or 'to be breakfasted'; and I will not pause to enquire whether, as Ahrens supposed, the forms δорπηστός and δειπνηστός (-ιστός) lend colour to a noun ἀκρατιστός synonymous with ἀκρατισμός.

Scholars who choose the noun suppose the meaning to be either 'until the fox [whom for lucidity's sake I shall henceforward call *she*] runs the boy's breakfast aground' and wrecks it for him, or docks it for herself, as though it were a ship, or 'until she lands it,' as though it were a fish. But all these metaphors seem very far-fetched; and though ἡ ξηρά and τὸ ξηρόν mean *terra firma*, no one has produced an example of τὰ ξηρά in that sense.

Those who prefer the adjective translate 'until she sets him down to breakfast (or breakfasted) off dry food,' which they suppose to mean poor food or no food at all; and this was also the view of one scholiast, who glosses ἀκράτιστον as ἀγευστον.<sup>1</sup> This too, however, seems untenable. For one thing, as Cholme-

ley says, ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι, if the words are to go with ἀκρατιστόν, should rather be ἀπὸ ξηρῶν.<sup>2</sup> For another, the boy, if his wallet is stolen, will presumably be reduced to eating grapes—unsustaining food, it may be, but curiously ill described as ξηρά.

Let us consider these two foxes again rather more attentively. The one, we are told, is plundering the vineyard, the other has different prey in view, and means to steal the boy's wallet. We are not told what diet it is that the second fox prefers to grapes, but we can guess: cheese there may be in the wallet, bread there will certainly be. And I never see this passage without remembering another in which bread and grapes are contrasted, and thinking that it contains the clue: Eur. *Bacch.* 274 δύο γὰρ, ὃ νεανία, | τὰ πρῶτ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισι· Δημήτηρ θεά | . . . αὐτῇ μὲν ἐν ξηροῖσιν ἐκτρέφει βροτούς· | δὲ δ' ἡλθ' ἐπειτ' ἀντίπαλον ὁ Σεμέλης γόνος | βότρυος ὑγρὸν πῶμ' ἡὔρε κείσσηνέγκατο | θνητοῖς. Surely the ξηρά in Theocritus' picture must somehow be the bread in the boy's wallet contrasted with the grapes the other fox is eating. Possibly, also, it is to point this contrast that Theocritus has chosen his other noun or adjective. For ἀκρατίζεσθαι and its derivatives, found in prose and comedy, are otherwise unknown to serious poetry. Grapes are not indeed fermented liquor, but they are the next thing to it, and ἀκρατίζεσθαι had been used in more extended senses before (Aristoph. *fr.* 607 K ἀλλ' ἡ κοκκύμηλ' ἡκρατίσω;). If a meal of grapes is to be named in one word and contrasted with a meal of something else, or if the meal is bread and grapes, then ἀκρατισμός is the word to use.

So far, then, I feel some confidence in the line of interpretation suggested. The rest is more uncertain. Commentators since Fritzsche have assumed that the fox is the subject of καθίξῃ, but, for anything I see, it may as well be the boy. One might assume that the second fox has already had a turn at

<sup>1</sup> It may explain the reading ἡ νάριστον reported to have been found in one MS. by Ursinus. This view requires all the support it can get, as may be judged from Kynaston's note ('ἀκράτιστον means *having lunched*, and so must be taken with ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι as a powerful expression for having had no lunch at all'). I am surprised, therefore, that *A.P.* XI. 205, cited by Wuestemann and by Briggs before him, should have vanished from commentaries.

<sup>2</sup> This difficulty might just be surmounted: Synes. *Epist.* 147 (p. 286) ἀριστῶμεν ἐπὶ ἀλφίτοις; cf. Athen. X. 419A.



the grapes, and translate 'until she (or he) sets her vinous breakfast upon a more solid basis'; or, more fancifully, as one might say, 'sets her grapes on toast' (Telecl. fr. 32 K *χαίρω λαγφοῖς ἐπ' ἀμύλῳ καθημένοις*: cf. Pherecr. fr. 108, 17). Or we might read *ἀκρατιστόν*, and translate 'until he sets her down to solids after her vinous repast.' All three versions seem possible, though, if I had to choose, I should choose the first. On the other hand I admit that, though possible, it is not immediately persuasive.

I have said hitherto nothing of conjectures, since for most of them there was nothing to be said. There is one, however, which seems to me to deserve some attention. Fritzsche long ago proposed *ἀκρατισμῶ*, arguing that the scholium *πρινὴ ἀκρατισμοῦ ξηρὸν ποιήσει αὐτό* pointed to the genitive. And, whether or no, the correction is easy enough. His rendering *prius quam ille ad siccum ientaculum consederit* (*ξηρὰ ἀκρατισμοῦ*, as, e.g., Soph. *Ant.* 1209 *ἄσσημα βοῆς*) has naturally failed to charm; but with the new interpretation of *ξηρά* here proposed I think there is a good deal more to be said for it. I should translate 'until she has sat down' or 'until he has set her down to the solid part of her breakfast.'<sup>1</sup> *Οἱ*

<sup>1</sup> *καθίζειν* is elsewhere intransitive in Theocritus (i. 12, 5. 32), an argument, though hardly

*μέλλοντες πολεμεῖν πρῶτας ἔτι οὔσης ὀλίγον τινα ἥσθιον ἄρτον καὶ ἀκρατον οἶνον ἔπινον*. . . . *ὁ καὶ ἀκρατισμὸν ἐκάλουν* says a scholiast. The second fox has had her *ἀκρατος οἶνος* in the form of grapes; the *ἄρτος* is missing. It is in the boy's wallet, and she will not be happy till she gets it.

Here then, I think, is a text intelligible and appropriate, and at that I should perhaps leave it. But there is a doubt which has from time to time assailed me, and I will, therefore, not conceal it. The one word which, if intelligible, yet strikes me as a little odd in all these renderings is the verb. And I have sometimes wondered whether we are all right in referring *καθίξω* to *καθίζειν*. Is it possible that it belongs not to *καθίζειν*, but to a new compound *καθίκειν*, and means 'to make a raid upon'? If so, I should translate 'until she has raided the solid part of his breakfast.' The *ἀκρατισμός* is then the boy's and not the fox's, and the contrast primarily implied in *ξηρά* is between bread and wine, not bread and grapes. The latter contrast however remains the essential theme of the picture.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

a decisive one, in favour of the former rendering. The boy, however, plays a purely passive part, and seems for that reason less likely to be the subject.

#### NOTE ON PETRONIUS' SATYRICON 135.

'Mirabar equidem paupertatis ingenium singularumque rerum quasdam artes:

Non Indum fulgebat ebur, quod inhaeserat auro,

nec iam calcato radiabat marmore terra muneribus delusa suis, sed crate saligna impositum Cereris vacuae nemus et nova terrae

5 pocula, quae facili vilis rota finxerat actu.

Hinc molli stillae lacus et de caudice lento vimineae lances maculataque testa Lyaeo,

At paries circa palea satiatus inani fortuitoque luto clavos numerabat agrestes,

10 et viridi iunco gracilis pendebat harundo.

Praeterea quae fumoso suspensa tigillo conservabat opes humilis casa, mitia sorba inter odoratas pendebant texta coronas et thymbrae veteres et passis uva racemis. . . .'

THIS passage is part of the only description in classical writings of an official

cult of Priapus and is usually interpreted to mean that the shrine actually stood in a 'grove of Ceres,' a partnership for which there is no other evidence. The purpose of these remarks is to show that no connexion with Ceres is implied at all, and to stress Petronius' debt to Ovid.

Encolpius visits the shrine of Priapus and sits on the bed in the priestess' cella while she cooks a meal. He contemplates the inside of the cella in the above hexameters. The objects in the room are noticed in ascending order: ll. 4-7 pots, honey (or oil?), baskets, and a wine jar, all presumably on the floor; ll. 8-9 the mud and chaff wall set with nails; ll. 10-11 the thatch and the



beam which supports it; ll. 12-14 the fruit and herbs hung up to dry.

One expects, therefore, to find the floor itself described in the opening lines, which may be rendered thus: 'No Indian ivory gleamed, inlaid in gold, nor did the earth, deceived by her own gifts, shine with marble now trodden under foot. . . . ' I have ventured to differ from the Loeb translator, who writes, 'mocked for the gifts she gave,' a version which disregards the essential meaning of *deludere* (to cheat), supplies that verb with an unparalleled dative, and leaves *suis* without much force. Perhaps Petronius had in mind Ovid, *Met.* VIII. 826, *exercetque cibo delusum guttur inani*. His point is merely that the marble was so polished that the earth did not recognise it for her own product. In this instance, he says, the floor was not of such marble. Then follows a contrasting affirmative phrase which must describe either the floor or the other object mentioned in l. 1. The Loeb translation, 'but the grove of Ceres on her holiday was set round with hurdles of willow twigs,' is unconvincing in itself, confuses the description of the hut, and strains the meaning of *impositum* and *vacuae*. The latter must surely here mean 'bereaved' (cf. Ovid, *Met.* XIV. 831), and *impono* can take an ablative in the same sense as the more usual dative (e.g., Suet. *Div. Iul.* 66), giving us 'a grove of bereaved Ceres set on a willow hurdle.' Thus, although in *Met.* VIII. 741 *Cereale nemus* means an actual grove, here *nemus* has clearly some transferred sense, possibly that of the fruitless straw when the seed-corn has fallen to the ground. Another passage of Ovid (*Met.* VIII. 655f.) is more helpful: *concutiuntque torum de molli fluminis ulva impositum lecto sponda pedibusque salignis*. It is obvious, I think, that both passages describe a rough bed-frame, strewn the one with sedge, the other with straw. Line 1, then, must also refer to the bed, and we know from such pieces as the 'Capitoline Bisellium' that the Romans used inlay to adorn their couch-fittings. Plautus (*Stich.* 2. 2. 53) mentions *lecti eburati*. It would be natural for Encolpius to start his sur-

vey with the bed, since he was sitting on it. Moreover, it was probably then as now the only solid piece of furniture in South Italian one-room dwellings.

Returning to Ovid we can compare Baucis' cooking with Oenothea's: *Met.* VIII. 647 ff. . . . *furca levat ille* (Philemon) *bicorni | sordida terga suis nigro pendentia tigno | servatoque diu resecat de tergore partem | exiguum sectamque domat ferventibus undis*. Petronius 135 . . . *simulque pannum de carnario detulit furca, in quo faba erat ad usum reposita et sincipitis vetustissima particula mille plagis dolata . . . 136 et dum coaequale natalium suorum sinciput in carnarium furca reponit, fracta est putris sella*.

In Ovid's story it is the table which is broken (l. 661). A comparison of these passages proves, I think, that Petronius is consciously trying to outdo Ovid. Further on in the *Satyricon* (136) a goose under the god's protection is slain by Encolpius: in Ovid's story (684 ff.) a goose about to be killed by Philemon escapes to the protection of the gods. In the transformation of the cottage (which like Oenothea's was thatched with reeds) Ovid says (701) *stramina flavescent aurataque tecta videntur caelataeque fores adopertaque marmore tellus*. It is probably in allusion to this passage that Petronius so emphatically denies that Oenothea's floor was of marble.

The mention of thatch takes us back to *Satyricon* 134. Why did Oenothea when intending to beat Encolpius take a reed *ab ostio*? Simply because a mud hut, as described in 135, needs a good overlap of thatch outside as a protection from the rain, and a person standing inside could only withdraw a reed where the ends projected over an opening. Such huts are common today in the Pomptine region. In front of each a barked tree-trunk is hung about with cooking utensils in the manner of Oenothea's *carnarium*.

In conclusion, I hope that these notes may serve to banish Ceres from this part of the *Satyricon*, prove Petronius' debt to Ovid, and give yet further evidence of his essential realism.

I. M. GARRIDO.

PLAUTUS, *MENAECMI* III. iii. 2  
(line 525).

A MAID-SERVANT is conveying a message from Erotium to Menaechmus. The MSS. give

Menaechme, amare ait te multum Erotium,  
ut hoc una opera ad aurificem deferas  
atque huc ut addas auri pondo unciam.

The sense seems to be, 'Erotium sends you her love, Menaechmus, (and asks) at the same time that you take this to the goldsmith's and have an ounce of gold added to it.'

Surely a verb of asking is required to introduce the 'ut' clauses. I suggest that 'oratque' has fallen out owing to the 'atque' at the beginning of the following line. If this has happened, a slight transposition will restore the line.

oratque una opera hoc ut ad aurificem deferas  
atque huc ut addas. . . .

This seems neat, as *hoc* and *huc* are in corresponding positions before the *ut*s. For the rhythm of 'ut ad aurificem' compare line 682, 'ut ad aurificem ferres.'

H. D. BROADHEAD.

ORATIO OBLIQUA — FUTURE PERFECT INDICATIVE IN CONDITIONAL CLAUSES IN PRIMARY SEQUENCE.

In all the works known to me on Latin Prose Composition I find it stated without qualification that in conditional clauses the future perfect indicative of the direct form becomes perfect subjunctive in the indirect form, if the

sequence is primary. Illustrations are given in which the Accusative and Infinitive, with its dependent conditional clause, is governed directly by a verb of saying or one of similar construction. Can such a statement be justified from the practice of the best Latin authors? Professor J. S. Phillimore once pointed out to me that in Cicero at least the preference seemed to be for the retention of the future perfect indicative. *Tusc. Disp.* II. 14. 32. 'Ecquid scis igitur, si quid de Corinthiis tuis amiseris, posse habere te reliquam suppellectilem salvam, virtutem autem si unam amiseris, etsi amitti non potest virtus, sed si unam confessus eris te non habere, nullam esse te habiturum?' *Ad Fam.* II. 6. 5. 'Unum hoc sic habeto: si a te hanc rem impetraro, me paene plus tibi quam ipsi Miloni debiturum.' *Ad Fam.* XVI. 2. 'Tantum scribo, et tibi et mihi maximae voluptati fore, si te firmum quam primum videro.' In none of these examples, nor in others which appear in Cicero, can the condition be regarded as parenthetical. I have not found in Caesar an example conclusive either way. *De Bello Civ.* I. 26. 4. 'Magnopere sese confidere demonstrat, si eius rei sit potestas facta, fore ut aequis condicionibus ab armis discedatur.' Such a case as 'sit facta' is beside the mark, since this perfect is merely the graphic tense for the pluperfect, as 'demonstrat' is for 'demonstravit.' In *De Bello Gall.* VII. 77. 8 there is an example of the retention of the future simple.

The foregoing is sent less as a note than as a query, in the hope than an interesting point may be further elucidated. J. T. MUIR.  
*Edinburgh.*

## REVIEWS

### GREEK LITERATURE.

*Geschichte der griechischen Literatur.* Von WILHELM SCHMID und OTTO STÄHLIN. Erster Teil. Erster Band. Pp. xiv+805. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1929. Unbound, 40 marks; bound, 45.

THIS book has now nothing to do with Christ's *History of Greek Literature*, whose place it takes in Müller's, now Otto's, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, Section VII. Of that section (Greek literature) Part I. is by Wilhelm Schmid and deals with literature of the classical period. The volume before us is the first volume of that part and bears the sub-title 'Die griechische Literatur vor der attischen Hegemonie.' This means that of the greatest and best preserved writers only Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, and the lyric poets, and no one

among the prose writers, are treated in this volume. Yet it contains over 800 large octavo pages. Christ-Schmid<sup>6</sup> covered the whole of the classical period in a smaller volume than this. So the claim is justified that this is a new work. But for the task which the author has set himself the allowance of pages is not too great. In his preface he lays great stress on the numerous influences at work on any writer at any given time and place, and on the life and influence of any piece of work after it has left the author's hands. He therefore makes it his object not to give a bird's-eye view of the history of Greek literature, but 'by means of a collection of *Quellenbelege* as nearly complete as possible, together with useful references of every kind, to give the user an

impression of the author's own conclusions, and at the same time enable him quickly to test other opinions too.' 'User' is the right word. There are few who will read this encyclopaedic volume, but few also who would not use it constantly with advantage.

It is usually admitted that the *Iliad* must come at the end, not at the beginning, of a period of literary development. But who would undertake to write a book of twenty-five thousand words on 'Greek Literature before Homer'? Yet this is in effect what Schmid has done and, considering everything, done with no small success. But inevitably a great deal of such a work must consist either of extraneous matter or of theories and suppositions at best only plausible. Thus we find a few pages on the pre-history of the Greek language. In a history of literature this might be better taken for granted, like the birth of the Dragon in a history of St. George. A summary of a few pages is apt to mislead the young student and dissatisfy the old. The theories and suggestions about early Greek literature are well discussed, though not everyone will accept as proven Evans' suggestion of the existence of a Minoan epic, or Meillet's theory that the hexameter is an 'Aegean' metre, or even that it was originally a collocation of two shorter verses.

About the existence of a pre-Homeric literature the ancients themselves had no doubt. It was associated with the names of Orpheus and Musaeus. But the Orphic literature that we know goes back no earlier than Onomacritus. This, however, does not mean that some of those religious ideas which we call Orphic may not go back to pre-Homeric times, and if so they may have been embodied in verses of some kind. Something more certain may be inferred from Homer himself, since much of what he describes is much older than the date of composition. The minstrels in Homer must have sung or recited something which we should probably call literature, and lyric poetry of various kinds was no doubt known to Homer, and known according to Schmid before the Dorian invasion or the first colonisation of Asia Minor. There was also, he says, a

quantity of epic hexameter literature composed on the mainland of Greece in an Aeolic dialect not unlike Lesbian. At the same time he rightly rejects Fick's theories and his 'retranslation' of the *Iliad*, which was certainly not written in Aeolic. These epics knew nothing of the fall of Troy, since the Trojan War, he says, was not a Panhellenic movement but an incident in trans-Aegean colonisation. But about the Dorian invasion and this eastward movement Schmid has stranger views than these. He adheres to the old opinion that Heracles was a Dorian hero and that his labours for Eurystheus represent a temporary subjection of Argive Dorians to Achaeans. Again, the existence of so-called graves of Agamemnon and Menelaus is taken as proving that they belonged originally there, and were worshipped there as demi-gods before the Dorian invasion, but that the colonists when they left home forgot their religious duties and, for poetical purposes at least, regarded them as men again.

The bitterness which Homeric disputations have shared with theological has been avoided by Schmid as in the preceding editions, and the carefully documented account of Homeric questions given in Christ-Schmid<sup>6</sup> has been greatly enlarged and in some ways altered. That the *Iliad* is the work of a single poet, though some prefer to call him a 'redaktor,' is affirmed, as is right, but not without an examination of opposing theories. The same is true of the *Odyssey*; again he would not have us over-emphasise the distinction between poet and redactor. But Schmid will not allow that *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are the work of the same poet. He finds the differences between them too great. Many of these differences can be put down to difference of subject, but not, he says, the differences in religious and moral outlook, which he finds too great to be accounted for by supposing the *Iliad* to belong to an earlier and the *Odyssey* to a later period of a single man's life. Yet when we come to read what he says of Homeric *Lebensanschauung* we find that *Iliad* and *Odyssey* go most of the way together. And when he makes them part company, the

*Odyssey* tends towards more ethical gods, greater optimism, greater hope for the future—little enough, even if true, to compel us to suppose that there lived two poets of the highest genius, one of whom took the name of the other.

It is hardly necessary to remark that Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, Pindar, and the other lyric poets are all treated with the same judicious care and valuable collection of references. But perhaps even more valuable to the busy classical lecturer will be the treatment of less-known people for whom most histories of literature have not enough space in which to do more than indicate their existence: the cyclic and comic epics, Pisander and Panyasis, early

Sicilian comedy, fables and riddles and folk-songs, Hecataeus and Charon and other early prose-writers. The early philosophers and the different sciences are also dealt with; these are less necessary, of course, but are evidently included in accordance with Schmid's plan.

It is almost impossible to do full justice to a book of this kind, and the reviewer is conscious of having failed to convey an adequate impression of the great mass of valuable information well arranged, well expressed, and well printed, which is contained therein, and for which all but the most learned will be extremely grateful.

T. A. SINCLAIR.

#### SPARTA.

*Sparta*, von F. BÖLTE, V. EHRENBURG, L. ZIEHEN, G. LIPPOLD (Sonderabdruck aus Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie). Pp. 132. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1928. (Nicht im Handel.)

THE Pauly-Wissowa article on Sparta contains 132 pages (264 columns). The first 54 pages, by Bölte, deal with the names (Sparta, Lakadaimon, etc.), the geography of Laconia, the topography of Sparta town; the next 40 pages, by Ehrenberg, give the history of the Spartan state from the beginnings of Dorian Sparta to her destruction by Alaric; the next 36 pages, by Ziehen, deal with Spartan religion; and, finally, a short two pages, by Lippold, dispose of Spartan art.

Encyclopaedias are not meant for the general reader. The volumes of Pauly-Wissowa, closely printed on nasty paper in double columns of bad type, and written in a style whose abbreviations and astounding parentheses make elegance as much out of place as in a coal-pit, are bought by all classical scholars who can afford them, not for idle browsing but because they contain so incomparably rich a deposit of learning. The sections written for the Sparta article by Ziehen and Bölte seem to me to maintain fully that extremely high standard. I am little qualified to judge Ziehen's section on the Spartan

religion, but I think it has the qualities which Bölte's section most certainly has. Not just a report, thoroughly and exactly assembled, of what has been established or proposed by others. That is indeed done, and Kahrstedt is patiently corrected point by point; but Bölte has made every problem his own, and handles the evidence authoritatively and at first hand. If, as I am inclined to infer from some passages, he has not visited Laconia himself, his control of the reports of those who have is the more remarkable. The results of his candid and eager questing are excellently presented: precision and clear thinking resolve many teasing problems, but nothing is glossed over and every page gives stimulus to further enquiry. The importance of exact geography, in giving precision to the statements of our texts, and making concrete the growth of Sparta, the helotry, the perioikis, need not be pointed out.

Compared with this, Lippold's remarks on Spartan art are profitless and vague. One small point by the way: Dorykleidas' brother is given as Medon. Is not his name really Medontas? Pausanias says ἔργον—Μέδοντος in V. 17. 2, and ἃ γε—Δόντας—ἐποίησε in VI. 19. 14, where Robert would read Μέδων αὐτοῖς for Δόντας. Whether Δόντας is due to a misreading of a signature (e.g. ἐποηε με δοντας) or a cor-



ruption of Pausanias' text, I cannot determine: in V. 17. 2, it is easier, I think, to read *Μέδοντος* for *Μέδοντος*, than to assume that (like Bellerophon—Bellerophonotes) his name could have two forms.

There remains Ehrenberg's *history*: and (since even amongst scholars some readers are more general than others) this is what will inevitably most appeal to the general reader. It is ungrateful to say it falls far short of the sections which precede and follow it; for to write the history of Sparta in 40 pages of an encyclopaedia is a thankless task. It is in many ways adequate: it covers the ground, it is well written in the way we expect of its writer, the historical appreciations are good, sometimes (*e.g.* 138r-1383) brilliantly good. But it lacks the candid and eager questing of Bölte. It heads straight for conclusions, and to make judgments upon them; and again and again presents a hypothesis instead of stating a problem. He justifies a hypothesis by explaining how it will work: the Plataeans are referred to Athens in 519, in order that Athens at enmity with Thebes may accept Sparta's protection, as she does in 510: the settling of the Messenians in Naupaktos was one of the injuries to Korinth which led to the battle of Kekryphaleia: Sparta's refusal to join Perikles' panhellenic congress is typical of the passive resistance which she offered to Athens during the 30 years' peace. There is no hint that the dates implied by these explanations are in every case most uncertain. Spartan history is indeed an interminable row of open questions: yet better than to produce *sub silentio* a hypothesis and make it hold water, is to establish rigorously what can be established (as Bölte has done) and to state clearly what still needs establishing. The history of the sixth and fifth centuries in Greece is cluttered up with hypotheses which have been made, at one time or another, to hold water.

The most difficult and trying part of any history of Sparta is the story of her development down to 500 B.C. It is also perhaps the most interesting, for Sparta thenceforward lives on her past. Ehrenberg gives 5 stages: (1) the crea-

tion of the Laconian Helotry and the Laconian Kleroi; (2) the organisation of Sparta town, described in the Great Rhetra; (3) territorial expansion, mostly northwards, and creation of the Perioikis; (4) the conquest of Messenia, the Messenian Helotry and Kleroi, the Messenian Perioikis; (5) the creation of the Peloponnesian League, and the great Reform, of which the lesser Rhetrai are documents; Ehrenberg tentatively ascribes it to Chilon.

This is not indeed the raw material for further research, yet it is, on the whole, an illuminating account. I offer two particular criticisms. For stage 2, Ehrenberg gives no date; but it is two stages earlier than the conquest of Messenia, and before the conquest of Aigyitis, presumably therefore not later than 800 B.C. That the Great Rhetra dates from the ninth century is to me incredible. Secondly, stage 5. I am always astonished at the persistence of the 'Chilon theory,' which has now had well over half a century's run. Ehrenberg restated it with emphasis in his *Neugründer*, and again in his contribution to Swoboda's *Epitymbion*: here he speaks, if I understand him, less certainly. 'By a rapid and systematic change the live archaic state receives the stiff *Lycurgan* imprint.' 'All this clearly happened under the leadership of the Ephors.' 'It is likely that one Ephor accomplished the essential part of this reform: probably Chilon.' Ehrenberg gives no date for this, and when he says 'den Ausgang nahm diese Entwicklung wohl von der . . . militärischen Reorganisation,' I am not quite sure whether he calls the military reorganisation a part of his reform or not: nor, from the last 20 lines of col. 1380, is it quite clear whether the reform comes before or after the early sixth century wars with Tegea. But Chilon's Ephorate was (traditionally) in 556; and Ehrenberg is at no pains to correct his formerly expressed opinion (*Neugründer* 30 f., *Epitymbion* 28) that the reform comes about the middle of the sixth century, *after* the unsuccessful Tegean War. Herodotos says (I. 65 f.) that a reform, which was primarily military, came *before* that war: the war was caused, he says, by their over-confidence





metrical unity (or quasi-unity) of each lyric, but at least a beginning of the sort of treatment that I mean is to be

found, e.g., in Ewald Bruhn's edition of the *Bacchae*.

G. MURRAY.

### PLATO AS A MATHEMATICIAN.

*Platons Verhältnis zur Mathematik.* Von DR. SETH DEMEL. Pp. v+146. Leipzig: F. Meiner, 1929. Rm. 6.

DR. DEMEL's essay is one of the latest contributions to the literature which has been created in Germany by Eva Sachs's able dissertation *de Theaeteto Atheniensi*, and its recognition as 'canonical' by Wilamowitz. I refer to this dissertation at the outset of my remarks because, admirable as it is, its very merits seem to have had one unfortunate effect in its own country. Apparently Miss Sachs revealed the great mathematician Theaetetus for the first time to German scholars, who seem previously to have known him only as a lad introduced into one of the Platonic dialogues. Perhaps this is why, when they write, as they often do now, about the mathematical studies of Plato and the Academy, they ignore very important work done in France on the subject before the appearance of Miss Sachs's essay. This is unfortunate, since it happens that the two most important extant works on Platonic mathematics, the *Philosophes-Géomètres de la Grèce* of M. Milhaud and the *Théorie Platonicienne des Idées et des Nombres* of M. Robin, cannot safely be neglected by anyone who is anxious to get inside the subject. Dr. Demel, for example, has conscientiously gone through the Platonic dialogues for the purpose of discovering what Plato's mathematical attainments and ideals were, but, apparently in consequence of this neglect of French work, he has nothing to the purpose to say about the very topic one would have expected to find most prominent in his essay, the obscure and tantalising account given us by Aristotle of the Platonic number-theory and the Platonic 'arithmetisation' of geometry.

In the examination of the dialogues, the precise order of which is assumed to have been fixed and once for all determined by the stylometrists—I am

afraid that M. Parmentier and some other good scholars would hardly admit quite so much—the writer has a double purpose. He wishes primarily to extract from them a rather full and elaborate theory of the character and methods of mathematical science, but also to discover behind them a biographical story of the growth of Plato's own acquaintance with the subject.

The story, as Dr. Demel reconstructs it, does not lack an element of romance. Socrates, he assumes, relying apparently on statements of Xenophon which really prove the direct opposite, had no real knowledge of mathematics, and it is not likely that he would encourage Plato to concern himself with them. Plato, accordingly, must be supposed to have made his first serious acquaintance with the subject during his travels, and presumably at Cyrene, under the eminent mathematician Theodorus. Here he 'fell in love,' like Hobbes, with geometry, and incidentally also with Theaetetus, the Athenian pupil of Theodorus, who became one of the first mathematicians of the fourth century, founded the science of stereometry, and, along with Eudoxus, the theory of 'quadratic surds.'

The *Herzensbund* between Plato and Theaetetus was really determining for Plato's whole subsequent history. In all that he says about the dependence of progress in science and philosophy upon the association of kindred minds engaged upon a common problem, right down to the utterances of *Ep.* VII., written when Plato was seventy-five and Theaetetus had been in his grave for some sixteen years, we are to see personal reminiscences of this intimacy, and we are even bidden to believe, without evidence, that many of the known mathematical discoveries of Theaetetus must have been made by the friends in common.

This is a fascinating story, and, of

course, it *may* be true. But I think Dr. Demel must admit that it may contain much more *Dichtung* than *Wahrheit*. There is really no good evidence that Plato ever experienced a sudden introduction to geometry at Cyrene. The whole story of his *Wanderjahre* is at least hard to reconcile with the tone of his own statements in *Ep.* VII. about his conduct during the years between the death of Socrates and the founding of the Academy. It seems to be implied there that these years were largely spent at Athens in watching the course of events, in the hope that it might yet provide an honourable opportunity of entering public life. (Apparently Plato's original aspirations had not been definitely balked, even by the fate of Socrates.) It may also perfectly well be true, as Plato assumes in the *Theaetetus*, that Theodorus was resident in Athens, and was instructing the young Theaetetus—and why not, then, Plato also?—at the end of Socrates' life. In that case, the romance constructed by Dr. Demel would fall through. The *Theaetetus* shows that Plato fully appreciated his brilliant friend's genius and character, and felt his death as a grievous loss to the Academy, but it shows nothing beyond this.

I do not think definite biographical results can be got by taking the early dialogues in an assumed chronological order, and noting in which of them there is any special consideration of mathematical problems. For I doubt very much the worth of the stylometric evidence when it is used to determine the relative order of dialogues which must, in any case, have been written within the same interval of a few years. And it seems arbitrary to assume that what Plato does not mention in a given dialogue must have been unknown to him at the date of its composition. There is nothing specially mathematical in the *Protagoras*, for instance, but the reason may be simply that it would not have been relevant to the purpose of the dialogue to introduce such matter. To my own mind it is one reason for treating the conclusions of 'stylometry' with caution that their whole-hearted

advocates insist on treating Plato's most finished masterpiece of dramatic art as juvenile work. But even if it were proved that the *Protagoras* was written, as Wilamowitz holds, by a young man of twenty-seven or less, I do not see how anything about the author's mathematical knowledge could be inferred from the absence of mathematics from the discussion. Dr. Demel's reasons for finding in the *Charmides* a mathematical strain which is absent from the *Protagoras* are quite unintelligible to me. I think he is sometimes over-credulous, as in his ready acceptance of the late stories about Plato's travels, sometimes strongly incredulous, as when he follows E. Frank in speaking with doubt about the Pythagorean origin of ideas which Plato himself ascribes to the Pythagoreans in all but express words.

With regard to the treatment of the other problem, that of Plato's theory of the functions and methods of mathematics, I find it hard to grasp some of the points on which the writer lays most stress. My difficulty is that he states the problems and the solutions he regards as Platonic in a terminology, never explained, which I do not understand, and which, I suspect, Plato would not have understood. We hear much of Plato's views about *das gültige Sein* and the *Prinzip der Gültigkeit*. It is very possibly my own fault, but I frankly do not understand the precise meaning of these expressions; before I could form a judgment on the author's justification for reading them into Plato, I fear I should need a translation of his phraseology into the language of common men, and I do not suppose I am alone in this plight. Where I do succeed in following him, I discern much which appears to me to be well said, especially in the pages given to the *Timaeus* and *Philebus*. But I discover other things which appear to me to be at least doubtful, and to need further argument than they receive. Thus, Dr. Demel follows Wilamowitz and others in regarding the *Timaeus* as specially concerned with criticism of Democritus, and holds that in some way it is an *Ueberwindung* of defects in the *Naturlehre* of that philo-

sopher. I confess that I am still not satisfied that there is any real evidence of knowledge of Democritus anywhere in the dialogues. There are some traces of knowledge of atomism, but these could be explained by acquaintance with the doctrine of Ecphantus, or of Leucippus. What needs to be produced is an unmistakable reference to anything known to have been a doctrine personally characteristic of the Abderite. In any case, I do not understand the precise character of the triumph over Democritus of which Dr. Demel speaks. He seems to mean that Democritus gave no mathematical analysis of his *κενόν*. But neither does Plato give an analysis of *χώρα*; he analyses the structure, not of *χώρα*, but of the bodies of the physical world. In fact *χώρα* itself has no structure; it is the figures which it renders possible that have structure. And it is surely unjust to Democritus to urge as a *proof* of mathematical inferiority that he enunciated his proposition about the volume of the pyramid without giving the demonstration, just as it is not a proof of mathematical inferiority in Fermat that some of his most beautiful theorems about numbers were enunciated in the same way, and apparently have not been completely demonstrated even now.

Another perplexing point to me is the interpretation put on the *Parmenides*. It is assumed to be specially concerned with mathematics, and even to contain 'Plato's mathematical logic.' If it does, I cannot congratulate Dr. Demel on the lucidity with which he has extracted the contents of the dialogue for us. I gather that he supposes it to explain in what sense the objects studied by the mathematician can be said to

be 'given,' since they obviously are not directly given as objects of sense-perception. But I do not find that Dr. Demel has succeeded in making what he supposes to be Plato's solution intelligible. I only discern dimly that he takes the solution to be somehow contained in a theory of the nature of the *continuum*. Now, of course, I admit that the *Parmenides* incidentally contains references to the puzzles connected with the *continuum*, as it could not well fail to do, in view of *Parmenides*' own assertion that 'what is' is *ἓν, συνεχές*. But I cannot find in that bewildering dialogue any theory which resolves these puzzles. Indeed, seeing that the ostensible result of the discussion is to establish the two alternative conclusions that (a) if you assert of 'the one' what *Parmenides* in his poem asserted of it, you must also assert all that he denied of it; (b) if you deny what he denied of it, you must deny also all that he asserted of it, I find it very hard to believe that the whole purpose of the discussion is not satire directed against the logic of others than the author. At least, I am sure that this has to be reckoned with as a possibility.

There are other matters on which I could have wished to comment, but space forbids. Dr. Demel clearly has things to say well worth listening to, but I would urge him strongly to cultivate a less esoteric way of saying them, and to make his proofs that his own interpretations are the right ones more rigidly cogent. I notice one or two unlucky accidental misprints in the Greek, *στοιχειώτης* for *στοιχειωτής*, *δυτοῖς* (*horribile dictu*) for *ἄντα, ἐπιστήμαι* for *ἐπιστήμαι*.

A. E. TAYLOR.

#### ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS.

*Aristotelis Politica*. Post Fr. Susemihlium recognovit OTTO IMMISCH. Editio altera correctior. Pp. xlv + 347. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1929. RM. 8 (in cloth).

It is generally recognised that the foundations of the textual criticism of Aristotle's *Politics* were laid by Susemihl

in his first edition of 1872, which comprised a collation of all the more important MSS. and a revised text of William of Moerbeke's Latin version from a Greek original of an earlier date than any surviving MS. Susemihl's fourth and final edition was issued in 1894. In 1909 Messrs. Teubner pub-



lished a recension of Susemihl's edition by Otto Immisch, which took its place as the standard text of the *Politics*. The present volume is a second and corrected issue of the edition of 1909, from which it differs very little in essentials.

In the preface the only important addition is a brief summary of recent views expressed, chiefly by W. Jaeger and H. von Arnim, regarding the composition and order of the books, a subject upon which Immisch refrains from expressing his own opinion. The list of MSS. contains a few additions, none of any importance, all of them falling in Immisch's class II<sup>a</sup>. The bibliography has been brought up to date; it is gratifying to find so many names of British scholars included.

The admirable *apparatus criticus* contains a good deal of new matter, principally conjectures made since the first edition and seldom introduced into the text.

In the text itself there is comparatively little alteration. It is beyond the scope of the present notice to discuss in detail all the changes which have been made, but the following examples may be noted, where the editor abandons conjectures or inferior readings adopted in the first edition in favour of the readings of the best MSS.: 1261a 14 he reads *διελκύν* for *διελθεῖν*, 1276b 38 *ἀδύνατον* for *δυνατόν*, 1285b 29 *κατὰ μέρος*

for *κατὰ αἵρεσιν*, 1290b 11 *δῆμος* for *ὀλιγαρχία*, and 1335b 21 *ἐθῶν* for *ἐτῶν*.

A considerable number of passages remain where the editor seems to depart unnecessarily from the best readings—e.g., 1253b 10 he reads *πατρική* for *τεκνοποιητική*, in 1272b 12 *ἀναρχίαν* for *μοναρχίαν*, 1285a 9 *ἐλάσει* for *βασίλειά*, (which should probably be bracketed as a gloss), 1308a 39 *καινοῦ* for *κοινοῦ*, 1322a 19 *δὴ προσήρηται* for *διήρηται*, 1328b 23 *δικαίων* for *ἀναγκαίων*, 1331b 4 *προεστὸς* for *πλήθος*. In 1318b 13 it is difficult to see why Immisch follows Bojesen in bracketing *μή*, while its insertion in 1341a 13 seems unnecessary. Among the more fantastic emendations, for which Immisch is himself responsible, are 1294a 15 *καλλωπίζεται* for *καλεῖται*, and 1319a 37 *ἐπιπολάζειν* for *ποιεῖν*.

On the other hand, Immisch refuses to accept emendations which have met with general acceptance, such as in 1265a 35 Vettori's *ἔξεις αἰρεταί*, and in 1342b 10 Schneider's *διθύραμβον τοὺς Μυσοῦς*. On the well-known crux in 1300a 10-b5 reference should have been made to W. D. Ross's important note in the Oxford translation, Vol. X.

The above criticisms really only concern matters of detail, and we must in conclusion express our gratitude to the editor for a new and up-to-date edition of the standard text of one of the world's greatest books.

E. S. FORSTER.

#### THE OXFORD ARISTOTLE.

*The Works of Aristotle*. Translated into English under the editorship of W. D. Ross, M.A., Hon. LL.D. (Edin.), Fellow of Oriel College, Fellow of the British Academy. Vol. I., *Categoriae and De Interpretatione*, by E. M. EDGHILL; *Analytica Priora*, by A. J. JENKINSON; *Analytica Posteriora*, by G. R. G. MURE; *Topica and De Sophisticis Elenchis*, by W. A. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE. Vol. VII., *Problemata*, by E. S. FORSTER. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1927, 1928. 15s. net each.

*Aristotle: Selections*. Edited by W. D. Ross, Deputy Professor of Moral Philosophy, and Fellow of Oriel

College, University of Oxford. Pp. xxv+348. Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 1927. 4s. 6d. net.

MR. ROSS is to be congratulated on the rapid progress towards completion of the great enterprise which he organises. Only the *Physics* and the *De Anima* are now required to finish the work. We are glad to note on the title-page of the latter of the two volumes before us the record of two fitting honours conferred recently upon the Editor, the honorary doctorate of his first University, Edinburgh, and the fellowship of the British Academy. All contributors to the series have recognised the exceptional



judgment and devotion of his editorial services.

These two volumes contain some of the most and some of the least philosophically significant of the pages which tradition assigns to Aristotle's pen. Even if the *Problems* were in bulk Aristotelian, which they certainly are not, they could do no more than illustrate by occasional sidelights Aristotle's point of view. We notice that there is no quotation from this work in Mr. Ross's admirable *Selections*. By the same test (which is not altogether a fair one) the *Logical Treatises* retain a certain importance, since they are allotted nearly one-twelfth of the book. But no modern estimate of Aristotle could give the *Topics* anything like the weight which their sheer bulk gives them in the *corpus*. But though in this thick volume the living and the dead, the significant and the insignificant, lie side by side, yet it is undoubtedly a great thing that the whole range of Aristotle's logical speculations is available to the English reader, now for the first time, in reliable translations.

Of the *Problems* there is a recent Teubner text (1922), but Mr. Forster's version contains a large number of valuable suggestions for its improvement, and any scholar who has occasion to cite the work will be well advised to consult this volume before doing so. Mr. Forster has taken account of Mr. H. P. Richards' emendations, which were apparently overlooked by the Teubner editors, and also makes a number of corrections on his own account, and at the suggestion of Mr. Ross. In the *Logical Treatises* the text is more reliable, and this factor, though never negligible, falls into the background. What is chiefly needed here is clear sound translation. The four collaborators in the work all give us this. They are: for the *Categories* and *De Interpretatione*, Miss E. M. Edghill; for the *Prior Analytics*, the late Mr. A. J. Jenkinson of Brasenose; for the *Posterior Analytics*, Mr. G. R. G. Mure; for the *Topics* and its appendix on fallacies, Mr. W. A. Pickard-Cam-

bridge. The only translator who indulges to any considerable extent in expository footnotes is Mr. Mure. There was good reason why he should; and few students will endorse the criticism of his own preface that they are 'too numerous for a translation.' Several other sections of the *corpus* in this series (though not in this volume) are more richly annotated, which deserve it less.

Finally, we come to the attractive little volume of *Selections* which Mr. Ross, nearing the end of his task, has made. He follows the order of the *corpus*, giving specimens from all the main groups, in the following approximate percentages of his 343 pages. Logic, 12; Metaphysics, 15; Physics, 18 (but of this, much comes, of course, from works not so named); Biology, 14; Psychology, 6; Ethics, 20; Politics, 11; Rhetoric and Poetry, 6. Thus Mr. Ross does so far conciliate the general reader as to give a larger space to the more popular works, such as the *Ethics* and *Politics*; but he shows characteristic ruthlessness by opening the volume with a definition of the 'equivocal.' To those who know something of Aristotle, and can pick and choose, the book will be interesting and stimulating; but whether those who know nothing of him will ever make anything of it may be doubted.

We add two questions for Professor Forster: (1) *Probl.* 949b 20. διὰ τί τὴν μὲν ἐγκράτειαν καὶ τὴν σωφροσύνην ἐπὶ τῶν νέων καὶ πλουσίων μάλιστα ἐξετάζομεν . . . ; 'Why is it,' he renders, 'that we approve most of continence and temperance in the young and wealthy. . . ?' We should like evidence that this is a possible meaning of ἐξετάζω. The new edition of Liddell and Scott seems to give none. (2) *Probl.* 954a 11. The phrase ἄλλος λόγος is taken as asserting that the question has been discussed elsewhere, and a footnote informs us that 'this reference cannot be identified.' But surely the phrase means only 'this is another story,' and therefore should not be described as a 'reference' at all.

J. L. STOCKS.

## THE HOUSE OF HEROD.

*Das Haus des Herodes: Zwischen Jerusalem und Rom.* By HUGO WILLRICH. Pp. 195. Heidelberg: Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929. Rm. 10; geb. Rm. 12.

WILLRICH is known mainly as a destructive critic, but this time he shows what he can do in the way of constructive story-telling. He tells the story of the rise and fall of the house of Herod in a spirited narrative, which does not shrink from such enlivenment as can be got from an analogy between Herod Agrippa I. and King Edward VII. It is just a narrative by itself without footnotes or references to the sources or any disquisitions except a few appendices at the end. The history of Herod has lately been set forth by Walter Otto in one of the supplementary volumes of Pauly-Wissowa, and Willrich's little book is written with Otto continually kept in view. So far as the facts narrated go, Willrich's construction of the history is less revolutionary than might have been expected. His object certainly is to present a more favourable picture of Herod than the prevalent one, and he does here and there contend that what has been generally accepted as a fact is a fiction—for instance, Herod was not guilty of the death of the young High Priest Aristobulus, and he did not leave orders on his death-bed for a massacre of the Jewish notables gathered together in Jericho. But in the main it is not so much a question of different facts as of different standards of valuation. It had long been recognised that Herod, whatever his crimes may have been, was a strong ruler who maintained order in Palestine and improved in various ways the material condition of the country. According to one standard of valuation, people admire efficient government so fervently that the violent deeds of a strong ruler count for little in comparison; according to another standard of valuation, the violent deeds repel more than the efficient government attracts. *De gustibus—!* Again, the chief objection to Herod on the part of the Jews was that he was more than half a pagan and, outside Jerusalem, built

idol temples and furthered the religions of the Gentiles. According to Willrich's standard of valuation, Herod was right in trying to bring his people into cultural community with the Graeco-Roman world, and the Jews in their stickling for the law were merely tiresome and obscurantist. Again a controversy which historical considerations cannot decide. Perhaps the point on which Willrich's book will most usefully provoke further enquiry is the question whether Herod's régime involved the financial oppression of his subjects. It has generally been taken as certain that it did. Willrich contends that it did not. 'He sheared his sheep, but did not flay them. The little that we hear about his fiscal policy showed that it followed the normal Hellenistic lines. The clamour of his enemies about the intolerable financial oppression is no evidence.' There is the awkward fact that Herod's vast expenditure went far beyond what could have been extracted from his kingdom by reasonable taxation. Against that Willrich says we have the alternative of supposing either (1) that Herod's expenditure has been greatly exaggerated, or (2) that he had many supplementary sources of supply—e.g., his share in the exploitation of the imperial copper-mines in Cyprus. No doubt further investigation of the whole question is required.

One notes with interest, and some surprise, that Willrich accepts as historical the account given in St. Luke of Jesus being brought before Herod Antipas. A new point of special interest in the book is the application of an edict of Augustus found in 1927 at Cyrene to the question of Jewish citizenship in the Greek cities. The edict ordains that inhabitants of Cyrene who have acquired Roman citizenship are, with certain specified exceptions, to be liable to the *leitourgiai* incumbent upon citizens of Cyrene. A. von Premerstein, who has published a commentary on this edict and the accompanying ones in the *Zeitschrift* of the Savigny-Stiftung for 1928, construes this as meaning, not simply that anyone already a citizen

of Cyrene who acquired the Roman citizenship continued to be liable to the *leitourgiai* incumbent upon citizens of Cyrene, but that inhabitants of Cyrene who were not citizens of Cyrene—Jews, for instance—by acquiring Roman citizenship acquired thereby also the status of citizens of Cyrene. On the basis of this Willrich supposes that the troubles we hear of in the Greek cities—in Alexandria and the cities of Asia—when the Greek citizens resented the claim of local Jews to be citizens, because they would not worship the same gods as the Greeks—were due to the bestowal of Roman citizenship upon particular Jews, which made them, according to the Roman government, *ipso facto* citizens of the city, without the city having any say in

the matter. This theory may prove to be true, but two objections to it occur.

(1) The language of the edict *may*, I think, mean no more than that Roman citizenship does not dispense Cyrenian citizens who acquire it from the *leitourgiai* to which they were liable before.

(2) One does not see why something should not have been said in our texts about the Roman citizenship, if that was the real ground of the trouble. No doubt it is right, up to a point, to read between the lines of our ancient literary authorities, but there is a dangerous fascination about it as an exercise of ingenuity, and it is often safer to abide by what the ancient author, who knew the circumstances more fully than we can possibly know them, actually says.

E. R. BEVAN.

#### A HISTORY OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

*Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue latine.*

By A. MEILLET. Pp. viii+286.

8½ x 6 ins. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1928. 25 fr.

NOTHING brings home the essential continuity of human development better than the study of the history of language. But books are few in which the reader can follow the main lines of development of any given language or family of languages without being lost in a maze of detail. Professor Meillet is a master of detail in the history of many languages, but behind the detail he always sees the working of some wider principle. This faculty, which illumines all his writing and teaching, was admirably illustrated in that work, indispensable to the student of Greek and to the general linguist, *Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue grecque*, which first appeared in 1913. He has now written what is in many ways a companion volume on the history of Latin.

To begin with, the author describes the salient features in the development of Latin from the period firstly of Indo-European unity, secondly of Italo-Keltic unity. And he shows clearly how far Latin, from the time of its earliest documents, had departed from the Indo-European model. But language is a human activity which cannot

be considered apart from other human activities. The previous history of Latin is known only from conjecture based on the method of comparison. From now onwards we are on surer ground: we have not only texts, but we know also something of the historical surroundings. As Meillet says: 'L'histoire politique de Rome et l'histoire de la civilisation romaine expliquent l'histoire de la langue latine.'

Fixed in the third century B.C., Latin maintained its form with comparatively little change throughout a period of eight centuries; for even when its unity as a spoken language began to be broken about the fourth century A.D., its unity as a written language remained. This persistence of language-form is to be paralleled perhaps only in India, where Sanskrit maintained its classical norm over a period equally long, but with this difference, that its spoken form, or rather forms, differed far more from it than spoken Latin differed from written Latin over the period indicated above.

It is the brilliant conspectus of the whole period which is this book's most notable contribution to scholarship: yet there are some points of detail to which particular attention may be drawn. Meillet stresses the rural character of Latin at the time of its fixa-

tion: it is no longer the language of an Indo-European aristocracy, but of peasants or small landed proprietors.

Hence the nomenclature of Latin is quite different from the Indo-European type preserved in Homer, in Keltic, in Persian, and in Sanskrit. Hence, too, the specifically popular forms of many words, the doubling of consonants, the use of diminutives and iteratives. He shows that, when Latin came under the influence of Greek, not only was the popular spoken language filled with actual Greek words, but the language reserved for more serious affairs, although avoiding the wholesale importation of Greek vocabulary, was no less permeated with Greek influence. Particularly masterly is his analysis of the main linguistic features of the great writers who made Latin the instrument of

civilisation it became—Plautus, Terence, Ennius, Virgil, and beyond all Cicero, to whom, more than any other, was due the incorporation of Hellenic ideas in the civilisation of the West.

Finally, the development of Latin into the Romance languages is displayed. Almost all who learn Latin at school in this country also learn French. Yet how seldom, if ever, are they made aware of that evolutionary process which resulted in the one becoming the other. Nevertheless, such a study, even in barest outline, would give a unity to their work, both in languages and history, otherwise lacking. It is to be hoped that every teacher of Latin or of French, or of any other Romance language in this country will read Meillet's book.

R. L. TURNER.

#### RESPONSION IN PLAUTUS.

*Die Responson in den Plautinischen Cantica.* Von FRIEDRICH CRUSIUS. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXI., Heft I.) Pp. 143 (including indices). Leipzig: Dieterich, 1929.

THE author of this doctoral thesis has ventured into a field of acute and bewildering controversy in defence of an unpopular cause. Responson as an element in the Plautine cantica receives but scant attention and still less support from Lindsay (*E.L.V.* pp. 312-3); Leo's determined opposition is bound up with his whole theory of the origin of the Latin song-metres; Vollmer (*Römische Metrik*, p. 5) says: 'Von strophischer Komposition haben wir weder Kunde noch Reste.' Nor does the principle of responson appear to have been always fortunate in its champions. Nevertheless, many readers must have felt that certain passages in the *Persa*, in the *Pseudolus* and elsewhere demand further consideration. In the book under review, a careful and systematic study of the whole question results in a vigorous adoption of the affirmative answer.

By 'responson' is meant clear metrical correspondence between two or more verse-passages (p. 2). The 'syllabic' responson of Greek poetry is

not to be looked for in Plautus; all that we are to seek is a general resemblance between verse-systems where line corresponds to line. The author discusses certain textual and metrical difficulties found in the cantica, and then (p. 61) comes to the enquiry proper.

First of all, the psychological background is examined. Plautus undoubtedly delights in 'parallelism'; we find it in the balance and jingle of question and answer in the ordinary dialogue. Such phrases as

par pari respondes dicto

(*Persa* 223) let the cat out of the bag. This characteristic of the Latin dramatist is quite different in ethos from Greek stichomythia, where the object of the speaker is not to banter or browbeat, or otherwise achieve a comic effect, but to persuade. We pass from the diverbia to the cantica, again to find these duets of greeting or of quarrel. The symmetrical motions of the dancers are not only reflected, but expressly mentioned, e.g.

O Charine, contra pariter fer gradum et confer pedem.

(*Merc.* 882). Next comes antistrophic responson proper, with its system of strophe, antistrophe and epode—the



divisions in metre corresponding to those in sense, and the effect being pointed by anaphora, assonance, etc. From simple examples we advance to more complex and striking ones—e.g., the triple strophic arrangement of *Cist.* 203 ff. and the elaborate scheme in *Truc.* 711-729. The formidable array of illustrations—some of them in tabular form—may well shake the stoutest scepticism.

How far, one may ask, are the supposed correspondences real? Is there much resemblance between *Truc.* 711:

lepidè efficiam meum ego officium, uide intus  
modo ut tu tuom item efficias

and its alleged fellow (l. 714)

sed cunctam prome uenustatem tuam amanti, ut  
gaudeat, cum perdis

for example? One must remember the extraordinary variety and freedom of Plautus' metrical genius; the versus Reizianus alone occurs in some two

dozen different forms. If the metre is sufficiently similar to suit a repetition of the music and dance, that is enough. Nor does Dr. Crusius lay rough hands on the text in order to make it fit his theory; he sometimes comes more closely to the manuscripts than do the standard editions. No doubt his prosody will not please everyone; we are very loth to believe that the penultimate of *restitando* can be shortened by Breuis Breuians (p. 72). But the broad fact of parallelism can hardly be denied by anyone who has read this chapter, which must be taken into account by future writers on Plautine metre.

In the shorter succeeding chapters Dr. Crusius discusses the relations of Plautus to his predecessors and successors with regard to responsion, shows how bacchiacs and cretics are often intimately associated in the same line with other metres, and gives illustrations of the occurrence of dochmiacs.

W. BEARE.

#### CICERONIANA.

*Die literarischen Pläne Ciceros.* By SIEGFRIED HÄFNER. Pp. viii + 118. Coburg: Druckerei des 'Coburger Tageblatt,' 1928.

*Ciceros Brief an Paetus IX.* 22. By WILHELM WENDT. Pp. 43. Giessen: Noske, 1929.

M. Tullius Cicero. 48: *De officiis*, by C. ATZERT; *De virtutibus*, by O. FLASBERG; pp. xxxiv + 185; 1923. Paper, RM. 4 (bound, 4.80). 39: *De re publica*, by K. ZIEGLER; pp. xxxvi + 147; facsimile of two pages of the Vatican palimpsest; 1929. Paper, RM. 3 (bound, 3.80). 14: *Oratio de imperio Cn. Pompei*, by P. REIS; pp. 34; 1927. RM. 1. 17: *Orationes in L. Catilinam quattuor*, by P. REIS; pp. 68; 1927. RM. 1.80. Leipzig: Teubner.

Cicéron, *Discours*, Tome VI., *Seconde Action contre Verrès*, V. Text by H. BORNECQUE, translation by G. RABAUD. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 16 francs.

THE work of Dr. Häfner on the *Literary Plans of Cicero* is an exceedingly careful production, only marred by the frequency of misprints. His object is

to collect all the available evidence about the works which Cicero began and did not finish; then, after a preliminary investigation as to which of the works usually classed under this head do in fact belong under it, to decide when Cicero formulated each particular scheme, how long he worked at it, and why he finally abandoned it. His results are given in a summary at the end, where he divides Cicero's literary as distinct from oratorical activities into an earlier period, from his consulship to the year 47, in which Cicero's literary undertakings are closely connected with his life as politician and orator, and in which the number of subjects leads to some uncertainty of purpose and to a large number of uncompleted works; then follows a period which is ushered in not so much by the death of Tullia in 45, as by the hopelessness of political life under Julius, first felt by Cicero in 46, a period in which he turns to philosophical work, and for the most part completes everything to which he lays his hand.

First there are three works which are

rejected from the category of unfulfilled intentions, the *De optimo genere oratorum*, where the introduction (particularly §§ 14 and 23) presupposes the translations which it was to introduce, though these latter must have been lost very early to account for Asconius' citation of the work, *nomine Ciceronis inscribitur*; secondly, the *De officiis*, the corruptions in which (*vid. infr.*) may just as well be due to the MS. being handed to Atticus in an unfinished state, as to its being edited posthumously; lastly, the political dialogue which is supposed to have been planned in 45 on the strength of *Ad Att.* XII. 23, 2 may in fact be the *Hortensius*. Then there are the actual works which Cicero planned and did not finish—the *De iure civili in artem redigendo*, where Cicero seems to have collected material and then been forestalled by Sulpicius; the *Partitiones oratoriae*; a geographical work in 59 which may have been projected as a poem; then political works, *De concordia*, planned possibly in the form of a speech in the Senate in 49 to hold Caesar and Pompey together; a letter to Caesar in the manner of Aristotle's letter to Alexander which Caesar wanted as a recantation of the *Cato*; a political dialogue in the mouths of the Decemviri of 146 to fill the place of the letter to Caesar; then a dialogue dealing with the death of Caesar, but abandoned because of the unfavourable turn taken by affairs. Of the historical works the most interesting is the *Anecdota*; this was to be a personal and intimate record of the years from 63 to 57 at least; it is quoted, but seems never to have been published as a finished work; perhaps it was too intimate for that. Finally, of the philosophical works the *De legibus* seems to be unfinished because of the uneven character of the books and the absence of prologues, and the translation from the *Timaeus* may have been meant to be part of a dialogue which would introduce the *De nat. deor.*, *De div.*, *De fato*.

Dr. Wendt has produced an edition of the letter of Cicero to Paetus on his use of the objectionable word *mentula*. There is not very much that is new, but the compilation of the evidence and literature is admirable. He has collected

references in Cicero, Celsus, Petronius, Quintilian, and many later writers, and these he works into his interpretation of the Cicero text, thus making a much fuller commentary than that of Tyrrell and Purser; he gives also a collection of passages relevant to Paetus and a brief discussion of his life. He rejects the theory that the letter is a separate disquisition in which moderate Academic views are held against the extravagances of the Stoic school, and the consequent association with the *Academica* and dating to the summer of 45; he thinks rather that it should be connected with Cicero's work on the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, and so dated to 46, possibly to February if the mention of the Matrons' festival gains more point from its proximity. The analysis of the successive Stoic arguments is admirably done. In the detailed commentary: § 1 Purser's *tu inverecundiam* is adopted; note that only the quotation of *Acad.*, p. 61, 14 confirms the omission of *ego*. *Demiurgo* is referred to Turpilii's translation of Menander's play of that name; it means 'the woman who makes the preparations for a marriage.' *Ferei* is Old Latin for *feri*, 'wild man.' *Violat: init, comprimit* are suggested as the objectionable synonyms. § 3 *Facis*, interpreted as *βυεῖς*, seems to me impossible with *dixerim*; it would have to be *dixissem*; hence the old rendering 'pretend' is preferable. § 4 The division of words is compared with the Stoic treatment of ἀμφιβολία. It is suggested that Cicero may have had in mind Lollia the wife of Gabinius and Aurelia the wife of Catiline. *Cliternini* may suggest *clitoris*. The difficulty of *sup-pedit . . . nudus* is cut by assuming a considerable lacuna containing an antithesis for both. Finally, some account is given of the use of objectionable phrases such as *cum no-* and *bini* in Cicero and Caesar; the evidence as to the former is certainly rather startling, but the latter is rather spoilt by the frequent use of *binis* to which Merguet bears witness.

The Teubner text of the *De officiis* is an admirable production; it contains text, introduction, bibliography, testimonia, and indices of proper names

and notable subjects and words. The editor divides the manuscripts into two families, X and Z, and postulates a common archetype for them both in  $\Omega$ . Of these two families X seems to reproduce the archetype more closely, for where the work is quoted by Nonius, and even once by Columella, the quotation agrees rather with the X family than with the Z. The manuscripts, however, of the Z group are better; the best is Q (Parisinus 6347) of the eighth century, but mutilated; next B (Bambergensis MV, 1) of the ninth century but corrected in the thirteenth with a manuscript of the X group; V (Vossianus Q, 71) and P (Parisinus 6601) are inferior; H (Herbopolitanus) and b (Bernensis 391) are their respective twins. The manuscripts of the X group which are used here are L (Harleianus 2716) of the ninth century, and c (Bernensis 104) of the twelfth century, of which folios 9 and 16 are written by a later hand and the whole has many errors from transpositions, etc., and p (Palatinus 1531) of the thirteenth century, corrected from a mixed manuscript of the thirteenth to fourteenth century and marred by the number of glosses that have got into the text. With regard to the inferior manuscripts the editor makes a firm stand against Mollweide and other scholars who have argued from the changes of order, omissions of copulae, and suchlike minor corruptions continually occurring in such manuscripts, that there has been interpolation in the text, and emend accordingly. So in I. 136, he is certainly right in keeping *ut ea facere videamur*, as against Mollweide's *ne*; in I. 155, *hominum utilitatem* as against Baiter's *caritatem*; in II. 57, *cogitandi* as against Unger's *congregandi*, though the theory that the last came from the comparison of men to bees hardly commends itself. Then come a number of corrupt passages where the editor believes that the corruption is due to the fluid state in which Cicero left the text at his death; these are divided by Dr. Häfner (*op. recens. sup.*) into later interpolations, e.g. III. 24, into small faults in the logical sequence of thought such as Cicero was always capable of, e.g. I. 51, and into the

larger doublets, e.g. II. 21 and I. 36, which he believes are due to the sending of the archetype unrevised to Atticus for publication: this would seem to the reviewer to be the soundest treatment of this problem. The Teubner editor then quotes a variety of parallels which he believes prove that Ovid, Valerius Maximus, Seneca, all read the *De officiis*; the method is dangerous: that there is a connexion between Ovid, *A.A.* III. 133, *munditiis capimur* and *De off.* I. 130 *adhibenda munditia*, is not apparent, nor are many other of the parallels adduced. At the end of the book the three surviving words of the *De virtutibus* are edited by O. Plasberg.

Though the volume of the Teubner text before us is the second edition of the *De re publica*, the reviewer may perhaps be pardoned for offering his tribute of praise to the first edition. Not only was that fully equipped with index, testimonia, list of previous editions, chart of the arrangement of the folia and quaternions in the Vatican palimpsest, facsimile of two different pages of it, and transcription of the five most obscure pages, not only were the variants so printed that one could see at a glance which hand had written what, but also the reconstitution of the text was carried out far more accurately than had been done before, and three hands, two of scribes and one of a corrector, were made out with absolute certainty. The new edition brings a number of alterations, many of them in punctuation; in some at any rate second thoughts do not seem to be best; but the following seem unimpeachable: p. 4, 19 lacuna after *clades* (if the line of the archetype was of the same length as that of the copy, one would be tempted to suggest *vel civitatis*), 19, 1 *LAEL.*, 19, 4 *catus* is kept (though it should be in inverted commas), 48, 2 *adesse*, 73, 5 *oneri* (cf. *Pro Flacco*, 33, for the same corruption in one group of manuscripts), 101, 27 *efficiebant*, 119, 13 *perturbent*; less certain are 13, 16 *excogitatum*, 40, 10 *ecferunt*, which spoils the balance, 50, 14 *obiectaque*, which seems to the present reviewer difficult and not so good as the text, 68, 15 *perpolitito*, which is not

so good as *περὶ πολιτείας*, 77, 14 *feram* is added unnecessarily, 83, 24 *ipse* is added giving the wrong antithesis, for that between *sentire* and *dicere* is required, 90, 27 *geruntur* is not so good as *reguntur* (which is supported by *Pro Sex. Rosc.* 131), 91, 23 *suntque* spoils the balance of the whole sentence, which has two *quoniam* clauses and two main clauses, 126, 14 *conferent* introduces an unpleasant run of trochees.

The new Teubner text of the *De imperio Cn. Pompei* uses the same manuscripts as the Oxford text, but adds to them II (Ox. Pap. VIII. 1097), Ch (Coloniensis Hittorpius, now lost), F (Fuldensis 181, 4. C. 20), B (Bernensis 254). Two new signs are introduced, d for the consensus of manuscripts Tπδ, and Δ for EWd. Not so much weight is laid on H as in the Oxford text; there is fuller quotation of π and W. The chief disagreements with the Oxford text are as follows (references are to the small sections and lines of the page of the Oxford texts, which is quoted as Cl.): 1, 3 *Quirites* ) *quare*, E (16 *cur*, E). 3, 7 *Cn.* ) *genere*, E. 4, 13 *regibus infertur*, for the very rare *adfertur regibus*, HCl. 6, 3 *belli eius modi*, Ch, for *eius belli*. 8 *magna bella et gravia*, H, for *magna et gravia bella*, which latter gives a very much better rhythm. 11 *a vobis* ) *a nobis*, π. 7, 5 *delenda est vobis*, EW, for which Cl. also quotes b<sup>1</sup>. 18 *mandavit*, π. 21 *Ponto*, HWtδ. 9, 11 *ac literas* ) Cl. quotes *electanis*, σψ<sup>1</sup>, etc. 11, 1 om. *pro*, Δ. 12 Cl. quotes *inultum rel.*, b<sup>2</sup>ψ. 12, 17 *quo tandem animo*, Eπ. 13, 4 *sicut . . . socios*. 6 *ceteros*, Δ. 14, 19 *tutandas*, Δ. 24 *et* ) *ad*, Wt. 15, 3 *est* ) *sit*, d. *pecunae*, misprint. 18, 8 nos. 19, 11 Cl. quotes *quod*, bψ. 22 Cl. quotes *unde*, σ. 20, 10 *obsessam*, Δ. 21, 15 Cl. quotes *inflammato*, δ. 26 *hic*, Reis; *hac*, H; *hoc*, Etδ. 22, 5 *profugisse*, Δ. 8 *persequendi*, Δ. 24, 2 *processio*, Δ. 3 om. *se*, Δ. 4 *se . . . conlegerant*, Δ. 6 *nam*, II. 26, 21 *quod*, π. 24 *confecti*, Δ. 27, 4 *mihi multa*, Δ. 29, 9 *illae sunt solae*, Δ. 31, 26 *exterae . . . ac*, Δ. 32, 18 *a Brundisio*, Δ. 37, 19 *quem e. imperatorem*, E Schol. 38, 4 *exteras* ) *ceteras*, E. 39, 16 *cuiquam*, Etb<sup>1</sup>σψ<sup>1</sup>. 40, 19 *quae illius*, Reis; *quali*, F (Cl. quotes also ψ).

41, 5 *nostri*, Δ. 43, 28 *aut contemnant aut metuant aut oderint aut ament*, Δ. 44, 10 *depoposcit* ) *poposcit*, H. 15 *vilitas annonae*, Δ. 45, 27 Cl. quotes *profecerit*, b<sup>1</sup>σ. 46, 11 *erat permolestum*, Klotz. 47, 21 *et ceteris*, Δ. 49, 15 should have adopted Cl.'s brilliant conjecture, *et cum . . . in quo sit*. 50, 28 *committamus*, Δ. 54, 5 *remansit*, Δ. 6 *quae tam parva insula*, Man. 54, 12 om. *etiam*, Δ. 55, 15 *peritissimosque*, F<sup>2</sup>. 56, 4 om. *et*, Δ. 56, 7 nos. 9 *vide-remur*, Δ. 57, 18 should have said that Cl. omits *victoriae atque gloriae*. 19 *consilio ipsius ac periculo*, Δ. 58, 25 *deberet*, Δ. 3 *minantur*, Δ. 61, 18 *et concelebrandam*, HEII. 62, 19 *viri*, II. 63, 14 *illum unum*, II. 64, 18 *istis*, HII. 20 *attulistis*, *Quirites*, Reis; *quare*, II. 65, 8 *cupiditatem*, Δ. 67, 3 *et quibus*, HET; *quibus*, Δ. 68, 19 *virtute*, Δ. 71, 19 *quicquid*, ΔII.

The Teubner text of the *Catilinarians* is by the same editor. Here, too, there are testimonia both to the whole group of speeches and to the single speeches, the titles in the manuscripts and quotations of the speeches are given in the *apparatus*, the argument of the Scholiast to IV. is given in full. The manuscripts used are the same as those used by the Oxford text, only h and i are reduced to the class of those occasionally consulted; new are the Rylands Papyrus, I. 61, and Harl. 2716, and the codex Caroli Stephani. The following are the chief divergences from the Oxford text: I. 2, 16 *vitemus*, βγ. 6, 20 *coniurationis potest*, AVot. 9, 24 *nostrum*, Vβγ. 10, 18 *liberabis*, aβγ. 13, 21 *inhaeret infamiae*, h. 14, 26 *domum*, βγ. 16, 20 *tamen ea carere unum diem non potes*, Reis. 18, 25 *evincendas*, βx. 19, 4 *ita ut*, aho<sup>2</sup>. 11 *qui*, βγ. 22, 17 *conligas*, βγ. 27, 14 *sic loquatur*, Quint. 28, 1 *invidiae*, Matthiae. 31, 7 *hic si*, CAVβtx. II. 3, 13 *quam multos . . . putarent*, after *defenderent*, CAVh. 4, 26 *in praetexta calumniatum*, Reis. 7, 4 *relevata*, βγ. 8, 20 *sed ullo in angulo*, Mommsen. 9, 25 om. *esse fateatur*, CAVβx. 12, 3 *electum in exsilium*, a. 8 *quid ? ut*, ah. 13, 19 om. *ubi fuisset*, xPrisc. 25 *sacrarium scelerum*. 14, 10 *atque exsilium*, Aah. 17, 13 *si me*, βγ. 18, 25 *putas*, βγ. 27 *proferentur*, sy. 19, 11 *magnam*



concordiam, maximam esse eorum multitudinem, Reis. 20 sit concedi, aß. 20, 26 hi sunt, codd. 25, 26 populo Romano, Sternkopf. 26, 12 motu, ßx. 27, 6 sed inceptum, hitux. III. 4, 21 civis cum litteris mandatisque, Nohl. 9, 20 data, Aail. 12, 12 et vide quid, tux. 15, 29 indiciis et confessionibus, hy. 17, 2 haec tanta in r. p., ßux. 17, 25 inventa atque deprehensa, ßtux. 17, 7 dum ille, ßux. 18, 15 possemus, hy. 19, 26 lactentem, Vhtu. 22, 11 in illa A. sollicitatione, Sternkopf. 16 Galli, praeterquam quod nos non pugnando . . . potuerunt, Reis, transferring from 21. 24, 3 eiecit ex urbe C. Marium, aßho. 25, 14 atque illae, x. 25 Lentulo, Gabinio, Cethego, Luterbacher. 29, 21 om. Quirites, abso. IV. 2, 16 haec sella curulis, sedes honoris, Reis. 10, 2 ipsum illum largitorem, Eberhard. II, 14 vos a crudelitatis vituperatione prohibebo atque obtinebo, Kornitzer. 13, 8 Vereamini censeo ne . . . nimis aliquid severe, Δx. 16, 29 hosce ordines hominesque, i. 20, 20 eam esse iudico turpem, Vaoux.

It remains to welcome in a few words the last volume of the Budé text of the *Verrines*. An excellent introduction points out the division of the speech into the exploits of Verres as general with a sort of preperoration in ch. 80, and the *de suppliciis* proper; this is worked out at length in the analysis of the speech. We are also very grateful for the account of Verres' character and of the political argument, fortified with full references: these references, too, make the notes to the translation doubly valuable. May I stress again the very great convenience of having the text on the right instead of on the left, as in the Loeb? The translation is very readable, and gives the sense of the original, not always the letter—e.g. *isti erogatas*, 'accordées à Verrès par délibération publique.' One criticism: Why quote in the *apparatus* as 'inusitata clausula' double spondees in *kola*?

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

#### THE VERGILIAN AGE.

*Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age.*

By ROBERT SEYMOUR CONWAY. Pp. xii + 162. Sixteen plates. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1928. 11s. 6d.

READERS of *New Studies of a Great Inheritance* will welcome another such volume from Professor R. S. Conway, part of the fruit of a visit paid to Harvard University in 1927, although several of these nine independent *Lectures on the Vergilian Age* have already appeared in substance in *Discovery*, the *Bulletin* of the John Rylands Library, or the *Proceedings* of the Classical Association. Professor Conway has here attempted, with his mind kindled by the study of Virgil and Livy, 'to identify the elements in the feeling of the time (55-17 B.C.) which shaped, or coloured, the thought of its great writers.' The resulting lectures are of unequal value. When, after rather unfairly dismissing Sir James Frazer's attempts to give an anthropological meaning to Virgil's Golden Bough, he

tries to persuade us that it is there as a symbol of *pietas*, we are only reconciled to the weakness of the argument by the felicity with which it is expressed. Lecture IV. is inspired by the two fragments of the *Fasti Consulares* identified in 1925 by Mingazzini, of which a photograph is shown: misleadingly entitled 'The House of the High Priest,' it gives a useful account of the nature and value of the *Fasti*, followed by reflexions on Octavian and Marcellus, and concludes unexpectedly with the story of the death of Archimedes. Lectures VI. 'Under Hannibal's Shadow' (stories from Livy) and VIII. 'Portrait of a Roman Noble' (character of Scipio Africanus) were designed for a popular audience, and are excellent of their kind. On the other hand, Lectures V., VII., and IX.—such an alternate arrangement is here shown to be Vergilian—contain many of those observations on Virgil's style and technique which we have learnt to expect from Professor Conway, most subtly illuminating even where he does not command immediate assent—

as perhaps (p. 66) when *genius loci* in *Aen.* V. 95 becomes the spirit of Anchises.

Everything else, however, is eclipsed in interest by the second lecture—'Where was Virgil's Farm?'—reprinted after revision from the Rylands *Bulletin*. We thus have easily accessible the arguments for transferring the poet's early home from the site traditional since at least the time of Dante—Pietole, 5 km. south-east of Mantua, in the plain—to the neighbourhood of Calvisano, a village about 45 km. to the north-west, *qua se subducere colles incipiunt*. The disparity between the country round Pietole and the scenery of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* has long roused the contempt or the despair of commentators. Professor G. E. K. Braunscholz first called attention to two inscriptions from the neighbourhood of Calvisano, bearing respectively the gentile names of Virgil's father and

mother, and Professor Conway shows how this new location agrees both with the life ascribed to Probus and with what Virgil seems to tell us of himself, supporting his argument with ten charming photographs and two maps, while there are appendices on the value of the Probus-life and the problem of *Ecl.* I. and IX. Unhappily this suggestion has had small effect, in this anniversary year, upon the Italian official mind—Dante has a long start of our two professors, and the *Selva Virgiliana* 'is now being carefully and gracefully planted between Pietole and the Mincio.' The evidence is not indeed—perhaps never can be—conclusive, but no student of *Eclogues* and *Georgics* can be blind to its great value, or anything but grateful to Professor Conway.

This book is very pleasant reading and nicely produced: there are few misprints, and three indexes.

R. A. B. MYNORS.

#### PROPERTIUS VINCTVS.

*Sexti Properti quae supersunt omnia.*

Edidit nouoque adparatu critico instruxit O. L. RICHMOND. Pp. 431. Cambridge University Press, 1928. 25s.

RICHMOND'S views may be summarised as follows: (1) C when recoverable is as important as N. (2) The many lacunas and dislocations in our manuscripts were caused by damage and loss to an uncial MS. earlier than our archetype. (3) The elegies were composed throughout in balanced schemes of numbers corresponding to lyric schemes. (4) *Cynthia* is the title of I. only: II. is compounded of *Elegiarum libri primus* and *secundus*. The references that follow are to the vulgate numbering.

(1) He thinks that F as against N offers very seldom a suggestive error or preferable reading (the example cited, III. 14. 19, could have been bettered). Vo. (Leidensis Voss. 117) is or represents the main source of the DV readings and is at least a generation older. It therefore supersedes DV, which are not recorded. Of the C family, whose exemplar differed strikingly from N, he

gives an interesting account, very concisely (thus not stopping to explain the good reason why the Mentelianus section I. 11. 27–14. 2 equals sixty-four and not sixty-five lines). He has modified in some respects his views of this family expressed in *J. Phil.* XXXI., but still regards the reading of C as of equal authority with that of N.  $c^3$  is the best representative, but in a few cases  $c^1$  and  $c^2$  are preferred to it. A study of text and apparatus shows clearly the weight attributed by the editor to this family: I. 2. 7 *tuae*, 4. 14 *ducere* (contrast C.Q. XX. 94), 16. 18 *tam*, 29 *silice et*, 18. 17 *calore*, 20. 18 *egressum*; II. 1. 5 *uidi* (!), 6. 36 *male*, 15. 7 *lapsos*, 18. 9 *ulnis*, 19. 18 *Veneris*, 22. 50 *dicere*, 28. 26 *facta*, 31. 11 *e quo*, 32. 9 *cur*, 34. 83 *minus*; III. 5. 8 *cauti*, 9 *inertem*, 21 *iunat*, 10. 6 *minas*, 12. 7 *intexta*, 13. 61 *uilia*, 16. 4 *lymphæ*, 22. 25 *Albanusque*, etc. Some of these—e.g., I. 16. 29, 20. 18—may well be right, but others are very shaky. Richmond is honest in the matter. He admits that C was much debased, full of errors, and in process of being corrected. A scrutiny of all the family's

readings does not, I think, lead us to esteem its value quite so highly as this editor does.

The text is at several places conservative, thus apparently rightly at I. 1. 25 *et*, II. 3. 25 *contulerint*, III. 7. 60 *longas*, 9. 38 *semper*, IV. 11. 63 *te . . . te* among other examples; but *sanguine* II. 7. 20, *hinc* 29. 27, *curua* IV. 5. 70, *sudet* 8. 78, *lucernas* 85, *cuius, rasos* II. 53 (is it unkind to recall 'whatever be right, *rasos* is certainly wrong, and certainly an emendation of *iasos*'?), *tace* 84, and others appear impossible. Generally speaking, quite apart from transpositions and lacunae, the text admits a large number of variations, some surely unnecessary; thus corrections of the Itali are adopted at, e.g., I. 4. 27 *nostro*, 5. 8 *sciet*, 6. 10 *ingrato* (cf. C.R. XXVI.), 10. 28 *effectu*, II. 19. 2 *coles* (cf. III. 20. 17 *constringet*, 25. 7 *uinct*), III. 12. 18 *suae*. He adopts 43 of Housman's suggestions (not *foliis abundans* III. 22. 25, nor the retention of *uoces* IV. 2. 19), recording about 70 others; and adopts 14 of Postgate's, recording another 50. Many proposals of both are unmentioned, some of which for one reason or another deserved citation, thus those of Housman at III. 19. 19, IV. 5. 19, of Postgate at I. 9. 32, IV. 7. 10, of both at II. 29. 27. He inserts in the text 60 emendations of his own (but is not *qui si* II. 13. 47 Phillimore's?), and suggests a further dozen in the notes. Not one convinces, several are unnecessary or bad, one or two untranslatable: II. 23. 22 *cupita*, IV. 5. 19, 20 *exorabat*: '*opus uerbis: uice blanda perure, | fac scissamque ferat sedula culpa uicem.*' The following merit consideration: II. 32. 5 *cur ita te*, III. 16. 9 *tortus*, IV. 1. 65 *qui Asis*, 10. 43 *Galli*. At II. 13. 25 he now reads *manda* ('*melius*' is too high praise); he gives up *Triopos* III. 9. 16, *Charitas* IV. 1. 73, *sagmina* 10. 43, but now changes the *sua* of IV. 10. 32 to *situ* (cf. C.R. XXX., XXXI.). At II. 12. 6 *uolare*, for which he has substituted *uacare*, is supported by the Cornutus passage cited C.R. XLIII. 126. Some punctuations are fantastic: thus with other changes IV. 4. 94 *o uigil in iustae praeemia sortis, habes*; 10. 45 *causa, feretri omine quod*, etc.

The critical appendix is based on a

collation of every manuscript of which information could be obtained in Western Europe and on a number of incunabula. In this respect it is fuller and more accurate than any hitherto published; for this reason, too, it is much the most valuable feature of the book. Doubt may be felt about some of the attributions and readings. Thus for L at II. 28. 33 has it really *poterat*, at 30. 19 *iam*, at IV. 10. 18 *poreo*? Has it not at II. 29. 27 *narrabat*, at III. 2. 15 *comiti*, at 10. 3 *miserere*, at 12. 25 *talpe*? One or two explanatory notes on obvious points might have been omitted, e.g. on *Latinos* IV. 6. 45, *laudate* II. 87, and a good few further suggestions of scholars recorded. The *Retractationes Selectae* find of course no favour, and we could not hope for Phillimore's *pauper*, at *interea, qui bibit, aere potens*, or Palmer's *lautis conscindere carnem*; but the former's *nesciat* I. 21. 10, *restet* II. 21. 17, and the latter's at II. 32. 54 deserved mention. So corrections at II. 13. 48 (Phillimore and D. S. Robertson independently), 22. 48, 28. 53, and other places, and things like *nec* III. 2. 16, and *atra* (cf. Bursian 208, p. 70) IV. 11. 30. But then there is no pleasing everybody! This appendix contains also a number of very doubtful statements: thus II. 13. 13 (*Ell.* II. 1. 13) shows that the first book of the *Elegies* (i.e. half our II.) has been published and not approved like the *Cynthia*; III. 11. 36 *tibi* is Pompey; 18. 29 Horace, C. III. 8. 19 supports *luctus*=*λουργός*; IV. 5. 57 supply *Coos* with *uersus*; 11. 97 supply *domus* with *habet*. The 'imitation' of IV. 11. 93 by Ovid, A.A. III. 59, is on a par with the resemblances to Propertius' style seen in the *Panegyric* and *Catalepton* IX., on the strength of which Richmond assigns their authorship to our poet.

(2) Richmond imagines that after the uncial was in part lost altogether, in part damaged, an attempt to rearrange and copy the loose pages introduced the present disorder into the text. He emphasises a number of isolated groups of 16 or 16x lines and, postulating lacunae (of the right length) and dislocations, a further number of similar groups; he infers that the ancestor MS. was an uncial or one written in

rustic capitals, with 16 lines on a page and 32 on a leaf. It was perhaps the only MS. of our poet then existing. At any rate, the scribe who copied it after its misfortune had nothing to go by; when faced with a loose leaf, on which were the end of one poem and the start of another, he repeatedly began with the second and postponed the fragment. With the aid of a few deletions, 120 transpositions, and lacunae amounting to close on 1,000 lines, Richmond reconstructs folio by folio the uncial, with 16 verses to his page, and blank pages for lacunae of 16 or 16x lines. A hazardous attempt is made to date relatively the fragments of the uncial dispersed in our II. The whole theory is constructed with elaborate ingenuity, but its foundations are in sand. The lacunae are often needed, not for sense, but only for the theory; the transpositions are frequently just as arbitrary, or create serious difficulties. Thus the transposition in I. 9 of 23, 24 to follow 14 violates the sequence of 13-16; in I. 16 of 25, 26 to follow 36 breaks the connexion there, and also the antithesis of *mediae noctis* (or -es) etc. and *tu sola* in its proper context; in III. 23 of 19, 20 to follow 6 interrupts the description of the tablets and the chronological sequence, past 1-18, present 19, 20, future 21 ff. In I. 16 he places 7, 8 before 13, 14, and construes *inter corollas et faces cogor deflere*! He moves the final couplet of I. 20 to precede I. 17, but *namque* more naturally follows 16 directly. In the combination of II. 9. 49-52 + a lacuna of 16 lines + II. 8. 17-20 + 25-28 to form *Ell.* II. 12, are 25-28 understood of the rival or mistress? In either case there are difficulties. The last 4 lines of II. 14 are transferred with an unsupported change to wind up II. 4, where they are just as abrupt as in their old position. II. 15 can be brought into line only by a transition based on a misunderstanding, and by an unwanted lacuna. He takes II. 10 to form a prelude to IV., disregarding a grave chronological difficulty in I. 16, and then, four lines being needed for the scheme, tacks on IV. 1. 67-70, which are inconsistent with II. 10. II. 34. 61-66 are prefixed to III. 1 and 2 to form his III. 1, *Virgilio*

being now impossibly stranded: 67-94 are detached to make a *Cynthia* xxii. for unconvincing reasons (since *modo* proves nothing; *Cynthia* is the lady, not the book; note also the polysyllabic endings 64, 66). After III. 4. 2, because two additional verses are needed for the first stanza, he inserts 19, 20, making *tua* in 4 refer to Venus. The transposition of 25, 26 in III. 8 to follow 22 and of 83, 84 in IV. 1 to follow 76 creates nonsense. The two recantations III. 24 and 25 have been joined by others into a single piece; Richmond appends also II. 11! In IV. 4, transferring 73-82 to follow 46, he makes 47-66 a personal address to Tattius; 59 ff. then are very odd. IV. 6. 17, 18 are shifted to precede 67 and left verbless and forlorn.

Similarly with deletions and lacunae. He deletes III. 7. 23-4, 21. 27-8, IV. 1. 125-6 (all being perhaps by the same hand), 5. 55-6, 7. 85-6. The first three present difficulties, though not inexplicable, but for the removal of the fourth or fifth either (this last supposed also to be later than the uncial) *reiciunt numeri* is no adequate reason. So there is something to be said for lacunae in poems like II. 22, but in II. 5 and 15 and elsewhere a void gapes because *numeri docent*. In I. 4 he has changed his mind since C.Q. XX. and now postulates a lacuna instead of a transposition: *rem explicant numeri*. In several poems transpositions and lacunae together solve felicitously certain awkwardnesses in the uncial's pagination.

In the Elegies some dislocations, some lacunae certainly exist, and one or two of Richmond's suggestions are not impossible. But no one will agree to such sweeping changes for such reasons as are here advanced or credit for instance such stories as that of the copyist's procedure with the ninth and tenth quires. Postgate perhaps went too far in his dictum that it must be shown that a passage not only cannot be placed in its old position but *must* be placed in its new. But certainly transpositions even in Propertius are justifiable only when the difficulties are real and serious, and when in their new place they do not create fresh diffi-



culties. Few of Richmond's changes satisfy this principle.

3. With his pagination theory is intimately connected his theory of the stanza scheme. Now in Propertius, as in the other writers of elegy, a balanced scheme is occasionally discernible (often to all appearances fortuitous, for elegy tends to run naturally in sets of couplets, just as it naturally lends itself to transposition): thus in our poet seven pieces in I. (5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19); II. 12, 19, 21; III. 3, 12. To these may be added II. 17 (if Housman's attractive transposition is adopted) and 34A (if a new poem begins at l. 25). It will be noted that with the exception of III. 3 the pieces are short and the schemes simple. Richmond supposes that every single poem is written in numerically balanced stanzas and that Propertius, thus rigidly bound by his schemes, is the most formal craftsman of his age. But this theory, based as it is on often arbitrary transpositions and lacunae, breaks down. Moreover, even on Richmond's own analysis his groups are often open to doubt. [In I. 4, 8A, 10, 13; II. 26. 1-20 (*Ell.* I. 15) he now offers a different system than formerly.]. There are surely breaks at e.g. I. 1. 35, 8. 17, 18. 5; II. 28. 15. In I. 16 his first, second, and last stanzas are not equally 4'4, nor at I. 20 are Aa, Ba, Ca equally 6, nor at 2. 20 the first and last groups equally 8'4. His analysis of III. 2. 1-10 (*Ell.* III. 1. 45-54) as 2'4'4 to answer

his composite opening stanza is worth looking at, as an example of self-deception. In III. 13 to get thirty-four verses in both A and B he marks at 23-25 a lacuna (for which there is something more to be said than he has said) and makes B start at 33, which is manifestly wrong. So in III. 10, with a glaringly wanton transposition *monentibus numeris*, that gives the show away, he begins B unnaturally at his seventeenth line. In II. 33 similarly B cannot begin at 17 nor in III. 19 at 17.

4. The title *Cynthia* for I. is, of course, doubtful; the inscriptions of II. (*Liber primus explicit. Incipit secundus*, etc.) tell against it. Nor do I think that he proves his case for splitting II. into two books: II. 13. 25 is quite inconclusive.

The Introduction and Appendix A contain some excellent, many disputable points: few will believe in the character-sketch of Propertius. The book is handsomely produced, and the number of printing slips inconsiderable. The hard things said about Richmond's work in *C.R.* XXXI. shall not be repeated here. Learning, industry, accuracy, ingenuity have gone to the writing of this book, though not judgment (*cf.* the note on IV. 7. 51 and Introduction, p. 62) nor a sense of humour (*cf.* certain remarks on pp. 7 and 224). He has done real service to Propertius by elucidating the importance of the balanced stanza scheme in some elegies; he has failed in seeking to apply it to all.

H. STEWART.

#### THE WRITINGS OF AUGUSTUS.

*Caesaris Augusti Imperatoris Operum Fragmenta.* Ed. HENRICA MALCOVATI. (No. 38 in the *Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum*.) Pp. lxiv + 172. Turin: J. B. Paravia, 1928. 22 lire.

A FIRST edition of this book appeared in 1921 in the Paravia collection of Latin authors, but no copy came to the *Classical Review*. Henrica Malcovati has now published a second edition, enlarged and revised, which merits a warm welcome.

The editing of such a collection must  
NO. CCCXXIV. VOL. XLIV.

have entailed great labour: notices of all the writings and speeches of Augustus are given, together with such fragments as remain; there is a very useful introduction, extremely well documented, and a short critical appendix and notes. Thus in addition to the fragments of the autobiography and of the private letters, edicts also are printed and a full text of the *Res Gestae*. Malcovati is nothing if not up-to-date, and she has included the now famous Cyrene edicts and the revised fragments gained from the *Monumentum Antio-*

*chenum*. (Incidentally, Antioch is twice described, pp. v and lv, not correctly for this period, as *urbs Pisidiae*). The critical appendix of 44 pages is brief and to the point. There is, unfortunately, no index.

The work has been extremely well done, and for anyone interested either in Augustus himself or in the Augustan Age this small volume will be indispensable. It is admirably edited, and Malcovati is full of enthusiasm for her subject. Yet after reading it I cannot help but feel that much of the essential Augustus escapes us: that great character still remains an enigma. The proud consciousness of achievement that informs the *Res Gestae*, the statesmanlike prudence of the Cyrene edicts, the curious jesting of the letters to Maecenas or Horace, the affectionate playfulness of his letters to Gaius—how can all these and other innumerable details be combined into a picture of the man which will be truthful and not incredible?

This book is so good, and can be read with such profit, that it is difficult to make criticisms for fear of seeming ungrateful. But one or two points should be mentioned, for alteration in

future editions. Why, for instance, is Malcovati so certain that the *Commentarii* of Augustus are not to be believed, and his calumniators always? (p. ix). And is there any reason for adhering so obediently to the Tacitean view that the murder of Agrippa Postumus must be due to Tiberius? (p. xxv). Among misprints, those on p. xiii, pp. 75 and 77 (*δσα* and *αι* for *δσα* and *αι*), should be corrected; and it is strange in this year of grace to find Juvenal VIII. 148 quoted as *ipse rotam astringit multo sufflamine consul* (p. 165). The section of *Apophthegmata* is one of the most amusing and interesting in the whole book, and well commented. It is curious to see how great men borrow each other's jokes. Thus Augustus filched a *mot* about traitors from Philip of Macedon, as M. explains (p. 111 and p. 167), but is it certain that the *Kαίσαρ* of Plutarch, *Pericles* 1, is not the great Julius? And surely the jest at Vatinius' walking powers was originally made by Cicero, if we are to believe Quintilian: it has the true Ciceronian ring. Other small points might be noted for correction: all can be easily put right and in any event they do not seriously impair this excellent book.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

#### A NEW LATIN GRAMMAR.

*Latin Grammar*. By H. C. Elmer, Professor of Latin, Cornell University. Pp. ix + 327. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. 6s.

PROFESSOR ELMER is by no means satisfied with the grammars in use in American schools. He denounces them in terms which will surprise those who find, as I do, the grammars of some of his countrymen (*e.g.*, those of Gildersleeve and Lodge and of G. M. Lane) very useful. 'Glaring errors,' he says, 'and contradictions and inconsistencies of every description have drifted down from grammar to grammar.' He has, therefore, written a book for which he makes very high claims: 'the method of presentation of topics followed in the present grammar will, I am confident, save for the student a vast amount of time and energy that has hitherto gone

for naught—a saving that in some cases will amount to seventy-five per cent.'

Professor Elmer is obviously very much in earnest in his desire to put right 'the countless things that are still wrong in our Latin grammars,' and many of his ideas deserve consideration. But his mind is too much occupied with the shortcomings of his predecessors; he is not quite enough on the look-out for faults in his own work. He trusts his memory far too much—*e.g.*, he puts a long mark on the first vowel of *odium* wherever it occurs (some five or six times); he says that *fur* and *supellex* have *-ium* in the genitive plural. Hence, though the book is good in some ways and interesting to teachers, it has many faults. Some of these are traditional and are to be found in many elementary books; it is the more worth

while to discuss a few of them at some length.

It seemed to me as I studied the earlier pages with the words of the Preface in my mind that the method of presentation might be improved in some places: e.g., (1) the cases are given in this order, which is usual in American books—N. *bella*, G. *bellorum*, D. *bellis*, A. *bella*, V. *bella*, Ab. *bellis*. Surely it is easier to learn N.V.A. *bella*, G. *bellorum*, D.Ab. *bellis*, and that order saves a little time in learning all the nouns, adjectives, and pronouns. As there is necessarily much learning by heart at an early stage, these little things are worth considering. (2) The Vocative will give the beginner a little unnecessary trouble. He will have to learn that the Vocative of *vis* is *vis* and that the Vocative of *ego* is lacking. (Even in the paradigm of *se* Professor Elmer gives 'Voc.—,' as though a reflexive pronoun might be expected to have that case.) Would it not simplify the student's task to tell him at once, what he would in time find out for himself, that the Vocative, if used, is the same as the Nominative, except in the singular of *dominus*, *bonus*, and the like, and in a few Greek nouns? The case could then be omitted from all the other paradigms. (3) The rules for the gender of nouns of the third declension should be made as short as possible because they have to be learned by heart. Professor Elmer's list might be cut down by the omission of all words which denote persons. It would only be necessary to refer to the statement in an earlier section: 'regardless of endings, nouns are regularly masculine if they refer to males,' etc. It seems a little absurd to state that *uxor* and *mater* are not masculine, and that *Venus* is not neuter. But, if a complete statement is desirable, *consul* should be added to the exceptions.

Professor Elmer very rightly protests against the introduction of 'unimportant details that constantly divert the student's attention from what should be the main object of his study, the acquirement, in the least possible time, of a good reading knowledge of Latin.' Is it then necessary for him to learn that the genitive plural of *aes*, *fax*, etc. is lacking?

It is not wholly true; *aerum* occurs in early Latin, and *facium* in Apuleius. Need he learn that the genitive plural of *dos* ends in *-ium*? It is not probable that he will come across that case, but he is rather more likely to meet *dotum* in Valerius Maximus than *dotium*, which is found in Ulpian and other jurists.

The paradigms of the verbs are admirably clear. Professor Elmer takes pains to bring out by translation and explanatory footnotes the more important meanings of the forms. It is interesting to see how he deals with the subjunctive, a well-known difficulty. He translates *amem* 'may I love, I should (hereafter) love'; *amarem* 'I should (now) love,' and adds in a footnote that this translation 'means *should now be loving* (if circumstances were different).' It would be well to add here a reference to the warning given after the paradigm of *sum*: 'For meanings of the subjunctive not noticed here or in the following paradigms, see under Syntax.' But as the beginner, for whom these translations are intended, is not competent to search through the Syntax for this purpose, it would be more helpful to give somewhere a short summary of the most important uses of the subjunctive. It would be instructive to contrast with the other uses the constructions (e.g., dependent questions) in which the original force of the mood is generally lost and is not represented in the English translation.

For showing the meanings of the tenses *amo* is less suitable than, e.g., *voco* or *laudo*. One is forced to use such expressions as 'I was loving,' 'I was being loved,' which are not used in English except in the sense 'I was caressing.' Some students will suppose that *amo* can have that meaning, especially when they read that *amabar* is used of 'an act [my italics] in progress in the past.'

It is well known that Professor Elmer is much interested in the syntax of the moods and tenses. (See, e.g., his article on 'The Latin Prohibitive' in the *American Journal of Philology*, XV., 1894; also C.R. XII. and XIV.) On this part of the subject he knows the evidence well and puts forward his views clearly and forcibly. His tone is

sometimes too combative for an elementary book, in which there is not space to discuss disputed questions; e.g., in explaining the Sequence of Tenses he declares that the harmless labels 'Primary,' 'Secondary' are 'purely arbitrary, inappropriate, and misleading.' The student will be puzzled and perhaps a little amused by his vehemence; for enlightenment he is referred to an article in the *Classical Weekly* on 'Some Shortcomings of our Latin Grammars.' However, the treatment of the moods and tenses is worth studying. But Professor Elmer shows less interest in some other parts of the syntax, and does not always take care to state the facts quite correctly. For instance, he gives the traditional rule that a verb, if it has two or more subjects, is usually in the plural; he puts the use of the singular under 'Exceptions.' This wholly misrepresents the usage of classical Latin. One sees this most clearly if one compares Lebreton's study of the question in his *Études sur la Langue et la Grammaire de Cicéron* (pp. 1-24). The old rule is roughly true for Cicero, only if all the subjects are persons, though even then the use of the singular can scarcely be called exceptional. But if all or some of the subjects are names of 'things,' the singular is generally used; e.g., *cui Romae domus, uxor, liberi, procurator esset* (*Quinc.* 85). Lebreton gives the comparatively few sentences of this type in which Cicero uses the plural, and contrasts with them a selection—it would be absurd to quote them all—from the vast number in which the singular is used. Cicero is not peculiar. Caesar almost always makes the predicate agree with the nearest subject, if he has more than one. (Cp. Meusel's note on *B.G.* 3, 20, 2.) Horace does so 248 times; in sixteen places only does he make it agree with the subjects taken together (Kühner, *Lat. Gr.* 2nd edition II. 1, p. 44). Statistics are repulsive, but they do help to show how misleading it is to represent the use of the singular as exceptional. Again, Professor Elmer says that *quidem* 'emphasises the word that immediately precedes it.' This would mislead a student in the interpretation of many sentences such as *Cic. Att.* 8, 2, 2: *quod me*

*hortaris ad memoriam factorum . . . meorum, facis amice tu quidem . . . sed mihi videris*, etc. Here the emphasis is surely on *amice*, not on *tu*. Nor is it wise to say that 'The nominative of a personal pronoun is usually not expressed unless emphasis or contrast is desired.' There are too many idiomatic uses of the pronoun in which it is difficult to detect emphasis or contrast—e.g., *tu* in the sentence just quoted, *ego* in *Credo ego vos, socii, et ipsos cernere*.

A good many of the examples are unsatisfactory in one way or another. Consider, e.g., *ego sum, tu non es* and *vestra qui vixistis hoc interest*. They can be construed, but they give no reasonable sense; one wonders how the speaker can be addressing people who do not exist. Sometimes the sound of the sentence is spoiled by some slight change; e.g., *Lentulus cogitandi non laborem ferebat* (p. 178 and p. 191). Cicero wrote *non ferebat laborem* (*Brut.* 268). Some quotations are ruined by the omission of a single word; e.g., the bracketed word is omitted in: *nil obstat tibi, dum ne sit [te] ditior alter; si [fractus] illabatur orbis, impavidum ferient ruinae; [at] tibi repente venit ad me Caminius*. The last sentence is given as an example of the ethical dative. Can such a dative stand first?

As Professor Elmer does not give references, the student will not always know to what kind of Latin he is referring. Generally it is the language of classical prose, and, as a rule, he tells us if a construction is found only in Livy and later writers or only in poetry. But he does not always do so. Hence the student will occasionally get quite a wrong impression. He may suppose, e.g., that *longi laboris damnatus* (§159) is a common phrase like our 'sentenced to a month's hard labour,' but when Horace wrote *damnatusque longi Sisyphus Aeolides laboris* (*C.* 2, 14, 19 f.) he was not using the language of everyday life. Cicero and his contemporaries employ *donec* rarely, if at all. They never use it in such a sentence as the example given in §301, *expectavi donec veniret*.

It will be seen that I am judging the book, as it claims to be judged, by a high standard, but not, I think, by an unreasonably high standard. The



writer of a school grammar has at his disposal much better reference books than his predecessors, so that he can in a few minutes find a good collection of evidence for almost any statement. *E.g.* the second volume of Kühner's *Latin Grammar*, revised by Stegmann, is a mine of information on the syntax of literary Latin from Plautus to Tacitus. Merguet's large *Cicero Lexica* and Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum* provide in an instant abundant evidence on many questions, *e.g.* the use of *dum*. Professor Elmer does not always write with real Latin sentences before him. He says that 'the nominative *deus* is used for the (lacking) vocative.' Is it really so used by any of the authors named in his Introduction? The list ends with Gellius. The fact seems to be that when the Romans addressed a prayer

to one of their gods, they called him by his name, not by the 'common' noun. It is true that *Deus* is so used by Tertullian and other Christian writers; but Professor Elmer does not deal with the language of these writers.

But, though the book has faults, it has also considerable merits. The teacher will, as I have said, find it worth studying, and will get from it suggestions of real value. It gives in moderate compass a very large amount of information about the language, a larger amount than is given in many elementary grammars. It is, moreover, admirably produced. The type is large and clear; the Latin forms and examples stand out well, and should be easy to learn by heart. The book lies open at any page, and the binding is strong and attractive.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

#### A NEW EDITION OF SUIDAS.

*Suidae Lexicon*: edidit ADA ADLER.  
Pars I. Pp. xxxii + 549. Leipzig:  
Teubner, 1928. Paper, RM. 36  
(bound, 38).

CONGRATULATIONS are due to the firm of Teubner, who have deserved so well of the republic of humane letters, on the resumption of one of their most arduous enterprises, the publication of the Corpus of Greek lexicographers, of which the present volume forms a solid instalment, covering *α-γ*, and on their selection of an editor. Fräulein Adler, a pupil of A. B. Drachmann, trained in the school of Reitzenstein and Wentzel, has attacked her formidable task with courage and has achieved conspicuous success. It is really premature to criticise the introductory sections in which she expresses her views on the sources of the lexicon of Suidas; for a reasoned exposition of these we shall have to await her long-delayed article in Pauly-Wissowa, and till that appears the reviewer must postpone discussion.

In printing the text Frl. Adler follows the example of Reitzenstein and indicates by marginal symbols the source of each gloss so far as this can be determined. It will be seen at once that the bulk of the material is traceable to three sources—the *Συναγωγή λέξεων* from which both

Photius and Suidas drew; the lexicon represented by the Codex Ambrosianus, B 12 *sup.*, which is shown by its agreement with Hesychius and the *Etymologicum magnum* to be derived in great part from Diogenianus; and the Historical Excerpts of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, which, as de Boor showed, contributed almost all the quotations from both early and late historians found in Suidas, who used some volumes of these collections now lost. There is little evidence that the compiler excerpted classical authors at first hand, with some well-known exceptions: he had before him, for example, annotated editions of Aristophanes and the *Anthology*. Besides the *apparatus criticus* proper, Frl. Adler supplies a full conspectus of parallels from other lexicographical sources, together with the references to the authors cited, and (in a separate section) cross-references to the other articles in the lexicon in which the same material recurs under a different heading—a compilation which must have entailed enormous labour and has a real value in the light which it throws on the method of the author.

It will be seen that the edition makes it possible for scholars for the first time to put Suidas to proper use. Little

fault can be found in detail with Frl. Adler's editing. It is not quite clear why *marginal* references are not given for some of the authors—e.g., Babrius—who were directly used by the compiler. And we notice that the so-called *Excerpta Planudea*, printed by Boissevain in his introduction to Dio Cassius and most probably to be attri-

buted to Ioannes Antiochenus, are not definitely traced to the Constantinian Excerpts (e.g., we have 'E?' s.v. 'Αντίβας and no symbol s.v. Βορίανθος). But no doubt we shall in due course see the question raised by de Boor with regard to Suidas' source fully discussed in Frl. Adler's forthcoming article.

H. STUART JONES.

### JOHN BAGNELL BURY AND JAMES SMITH REID.

1. *A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury*. Compiled with a Memoir by NORMAN H. BAYNES. Pp. 184. Cambridge University Press, 1929. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
2. *John Bagnell Bury, 1861-1927*. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XII. By NORMAN H. BAYNES. Pp. 13. Paper, 1s. net.
3. *James Smith Reid, 1846-1926*. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XIII. By A. C. CLARK, A. SOUTER, and F. E. ADCOCK. Pp. 13. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.

AVOIDING an unfruitful comparison of two great scholars, let me begin by stating two significant facts in the case of Bury. He did not quite reach the age of sixty-six years. The Bibliography, comprising books, reviews, constructive articles, editions and re-editions, notes of textual criticism, trifles in Greek or Latin verse, contributions to the histories of many countries from Bulgaria to Ireland, and other items, makes up a total of 369 heads covering 45 pages. Incidentally it records the use of the numerous languages, including Russian, that formed part of the equipment of this astounding scholar.

For scholar he was above all things. If, as was natural in so wide a range of study, opinions had to be modified or abandoned, the change was not due to fickle judgment but the effect of new evidence or new interpretation. But this readiness to revise earlier views was surely a phase of intellectual honesty, disengaged by the fermentation of new knowledge acquired at abnormal speed.

It is just this heroic honesty that stands out as the main feature of Bury's character in the worthy picture Mr. Baynes has given us of his life and work.

It is of interest to know that poetry, philosophy, and music were influences on his development, but that the great Greek Classics were his first and last love. More important, as the message of a great career of wide and ceaseless research, is the uncompromising rationalism that characterised him from first to last. On this quality Mr. Baynes dwells in a masterly passage of some six pages (76-81), and shows how important it is for the understanding of Bury's work. Of his scepticism, the 'twin-brother of rationalism,' it is justly observed (p. 93) that it gave Bury the capacity to question traditional judgments; which we may admit to be 'one of the greatest assets of any historical student.' No wonder that, ranging over so many fields of inquiry with this questioning alertness at full power, he was sometimes hasty in changing his own views, and to staid observers seemed inconsistent. But consistency as a virtue had no charm for him, as Mr. Baynes points out (p. 102); and indeed its only value to a historian is as a check on over-hasty conclusions. The subject-matter of human history is so dominated by the bias of witnesses and the accidents of survival that without continual revision no progress toward truth is possible.

A more serious criticism is the passage (p. 100) dealing with Bury's historiographic method. He would treat this or that part of a book as a problem to be solved by minute research, producing what was in fact a monograph complete in itself and tending to appear diffuse in spite of masterly brevity. But in combining the parts to form a whole he was less happy. The correlation of the several parts was apt to fail from lack of

due proportion between them as parts of a whole—the critic had got the better of the artist. True, no doubt. And I heartily agree that Bury's occasional diffuseness is totally different from the diffuseness of Freeman—yes, indeed.

But I must not forget that the subject of this notice is not so much the method and principles of Bury as the critical handling of these by Mr. Baynes. In this connexion perhaps the passage (pp. 72-6) in which Bury's 'conception of historical contingency' is discussed may be considered the most important part of the memoir. The quotations from the author's works are samples of the application of Burian logic to the material furnished by Burian learning. Fascinating they are, and well calculated to promote the rational study of human history by those who attempt to write it. The old question of causes and effects is handled with brilliant ingenuity and illustrated by instances from history. Bury holds that chance does not imply the intrusion of a lawless element; he defines it rather as the collision of two or more independent chains of causes, from which collision consequences follow. Now, others before Bury have pointed out that accidents disturb the course of human affairs and must not be left out of reckoning. But Bury seems to go a step beyond this fatalistic acquiescence. He concludes that 'a systematic study of contingencies is a necessary preliminary to any speculations which aim at historical synthesis.' This doctrine is supported by an acute argument drawn from the accidents on which the origin of species (including man) and their development seem to have depended. He finds, however, that at a certain stage the experience and knowledge of man became predominant in social evolution. Hence the logic in the 'historical process,' so far as it is logical. Contingencies may upset the logical consequences, 'and it is this which makes history so interesting and so baffling.' To me neither this doctrine nor the illustrations offered from the Decline of the Roman Empire are satisfactory. That the collapse of the Empire in the West and the foundation of barbarian states in the western provinces 'cannot

be explained by any general considerations' seems to me a proposition only tenable if your general considerations are based on a secure inattention to ascertainable facts. I submit that without general considerations, of course suggested by the study of the available details, it is not possible to 'rationalise' the story of the Decline and Fall. And I gather from Mr. Baynes' criticism that he does not see much hope for the future of a historiography based on the theory propounded by Bury.

This objection, if sustained, need not tempt us to undervalue the services of the author of the *Idea of Progress*, the *Study of History*, the *History of the Later Roman Empire*, and many other books of note; or the editor of Gibbon. But it does imply that Bury was first and foremost a leader of research, less eminent as a formal historiographer. The Bibliography is by itself a sufficient commentary on this conclusion. That Bury was not a typical Committee-man, and that he knew it, is duly recorded (pp. 51-2) in the memoir. That he had no great appetite for formal lecture-work was known to all who knew him in Cambridge. These traits are part of the same character, that of the enthusiastic student, ever straining a delicate physique in the pursuit of a series of inquiries offering no hope of finality. The brave endurance of his later years, as he worked and sank by degrees without losing his singular boyish charm, are a sad but gracious memory to those who knew him. Ireland has given not a few precious sons to Cambridge, and Bury was not the least of them.

In the late Professor J. S. Reid we come upon a very different figure. To the memoirs from the pens of Professors Souter and A. C. Clark and his successor, Professor Adcock, it is only necessary to add a few words. As a friend of Reid for many years, and an admirer of his wide and solid learning, I lament that he has not left more published works behind him. As private tutor, as College lecturer, as Professor, he never spared himself in the performance of his immediate duty, and his time free for research and writing was severely limited. That he did so

much I attribute mainly to the fact of his having started his academic career with an equipment rare and well adapted to place him at an advantage compared with most students of his standing. To him it was easy to graduate B.A. with Mathematical Honours, then to become Whewell Scholar in International Law, and to proceed LL.M. in 1872. That he was bracketed equal Senior Classic in 1869, and First Chancellor's Classical Medallist, were incidents unconnected with his Cambridge Degrees; he never took the M.A. In his knowledge of German, and acquaintance with modern methods of philological study, he was ahead of his contemporaries. These resources found no direct application in the Classical Tripos as it was before 1872. The new scheme that came into force in that year at once brought Reid to the front as a teacher. To dwell on his success in this duty, and to chronicle the output of up-to-date Classical works that he somehow found time to produce, would be waste of time after the memoirs of the Professors cited above.

If he became an authority on Cicero and Ciceronian Latin second to none, this was only one department of his sound and varied learning. Of his place as a Latin scholar Professor A. C. Clark writes with authority and in terms not too strong for Reid's deserts. So does Professor Adcock of his work as Professor of Ancient History. The post was newly established in 1899, and he held it and created its traditions for about a quarter of a century. The chief published work of this period, *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire*, is a valuable treatise, the accuracy of which can only be fully appreciated by those who have given some independent study to the subject. For circumstances drove him to issue it without references to authorities, and in a book of the kind this is a pity.

With the generous tributes to Reid's personal character paid by the writers of these memoirs I ask leave freely to associate myself. He was one of our great scholars and served Cambridge right well.

W. E. HEITLAND.

*Attic Black-figure: A Sketch.* By J. D. BEAZLEY. Pp. 50; 16 plates. London: Humphrey Milford. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, 1928. 7s. 6d.

A GOOD lecture does not always make good reading, but Professor Beazley's lecture to the British Academy is, if possible, more attractive in essay form. The reader has what the listener lacked: time fully to admire the art with which a complex subject is developed and to enjoy the beautiful if sometimes too exotic English. An appendix has now been added to the original essay with lists of the vases by some of the masters mentioned in the text: these include well-known figures like Exekias and the Affected painter, new-comers like the Lysippides painter and the Acheloos painter, and a new group, the Leagros group.

In spite of valuable contributions by several well-known scholars, the Attic black-figure style has been less explored than other fabrics of the same standing, and Professor Beazley only claims to give a preliminary survey. Nevertheless, he has managed to include all that is essential: the most important personalities are introduced; tendencies traced; the evolution of the more popular vase-shapes described. He reminds us that the style was adopted—or should one say readopted?—by artists already accustomed to the outline technique of the seventh century, and points out that this was done because black-figure was eminently suitable to the decoration of a vase and outline technique was not. There follows an important account of the

early stages of the style, particularly of certain experiments in amphorae. In short, the 'sketch' is so perfect an introduction to the subject that one wishes each big book could be preceded by a little book like this: it goes without saying that this little book should be followed by a big one.

Two points only seem to me to deserve criticism. The first is the scarcity of dates. It has become a convention that no dates should be published till they can be determined within a very narrow margin, but why should not approximate dates appear modestly in the appendix? The second is the mention of modern scholars' names in the text, which, in an essay of this kind, startles the reader, and in a lecture, only interests the audience if violently polemic.

WINIFRED LAMB.

*Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion.* By WOLFGANG SCHADEWALDT. (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse V. 3.) Pp. 85. Halle: Niemeyer, 1928. Paper, R.M. 6.

THIS treatise is an admirably sane and subtle study of Pindar's artistic and spiritual development. It is deeply indebted to the work of Wilamowitz, whose general verdicts (for instance, on the date and circumstances of the Second and Third Pythians) are sometimes accepted rather too readily; but Schadewaldt is thoroughly independent, and makes many convincing criticisms of the details of Wilamowitz's work. He rightly maintains that the



Drachmann reaction against the school of Dissen and his followers has gone much too far, and that the Odes have a real and powerful unity of construction and idea.

He skilfully analyses and illustrates the typical structure of the *Epinikion*, and shows its intimate connexion with the ideas of the Dorian aristocracy, and then traces the steps by which Pindar, without abandoning the old form, succeeded in expanding and spiritualising its content. More than a third of the space is devoted to a minute examination of the Seventh Nemean, taken as an example of Pindar's earlier manner, and he has also much to say of the Second Pythian, as an illustration of his later methods. The work is packed with matter, and no detailed analysis or criticism can here be attempted; it must be enough to say that every page deserves the careful consideration of all students of Pindar. It would be difficult to frame a juster summary of Pindar's significance than the last paragraph of the treatise: 'Über dem Leben Pindars liegt eine geheime Tragik: fruchtloses Ringen um den geistigen Bestand einer Kultur, die der reinen Begeisterung des Dichters nicht mehr würdig war und sich schneller als der Dichter selber zu Ende lebte. Wir haben demgegenüber nicht zu vergessen, dass der Dichter selbst mehr und mehr seiner versinkenden Zeit entwachsen ist: die dorische Art, die er nie aufgab, führte er in reinem Bilde damit als dauernden Teil und Besitz dem griechischen Geiste zu, der sie bis auf uns erhalten hat.' D. S. ROBERTSON.

*Stilistische Untersuchung der Epinomis des Philippos von Opus.* Von FRIEDRICH MÜLLER. Pp. 73. Gräfenhainichen: Schulze, 1927.

DR. MÜLLER'S very able and well-written dissertation is, as its title indicates, a stylistic analysis of the *Epinomis*, justifying its ascription to Philip of Opus rather than to Plato. The analysis is divided into three parts roughly describable as (1) words and phrases, (2) sentence-structure, (3) general plan and aim. But throughout Dr. Müller keeps the wider questions in view, so that the dissertation as a whole results not merely in a fairly full and definite appreciation of the *Epinomis*, but also in valuable contributions to the analysis of the style of the *Laws*. Attention had previously been called to the fact that there are some thirty words in the *Epinomis* not elsewhere found in the Dialogues; but this is not so large a list of novelties as can be produced from almost any passage of similar length in the *Laws*. Dr. Müller, therefore, argues from such terms only when their use or formation seems to run counter to Platonic usage, and he supplements them by a consideration of terms belonging to Plato's normal vocabulary which take here a peculiar colour. Almost any detail is open to doubt, but cumulatively his case is strong, leading to the conclusion that the *Epinomis* was designed as a *Protrepticus* for the benefit of students in the Academy immediately after Plato's death.

Some of the major points which he makes are these:

1. He examines the notion of *σοφία* from which the *Epinomis* starts, and argues that it is unplatonic; that essentially it has nothing to do with the *νυκτερινὸς σύλλογος* of the *Laws*, but is conceived rather as a condition of the holiness and happiness of the life of the individual.

2. He seeks to show that the religious conceptions and terminology of the *Epinomis* are at variance with those of the *Laws* in a number of points.

3. He argues that stylistically the *Epinomis* shows the characteristic marks of an imitation in that it follows the Plato of the *Laws* even to exaggeration in minor details (such as periphrasis) while failing to reproduce the deeper structural features (e.g., the balance of subordinate clauses in long sentences).

4. He finds that in the *Epinomis* the element of dialogue has become mere form, the chief speaker having in mind not the two friends with whom he is nominally speaking, but a larger and different audience (the Academy), and speaking no longer even in word of a city which he is founding, but of the principles of education for these young men.

The dissertation deserves close attention from all students of Plato. J. L. STOCKS.

*La dissoluzione della libertà nella Grecia antica.* By A. FERRABINO. Pp. 118. A. Milani, Padua, 1929. Paper, 12 lire.

PROFESSOR FERRABINO here publishes four lectures delivered in 1928 in the School of Political and Social Sciences of the University of Padua, setting forth the essential facts, or rather the fundamental tendencies, of Greek history. No attempt is made to summarise all the important events of the millennium which is passed under review, to compress the history of the Greek world into the briefest possible compass. The effect produced by these lectures is rather one of leisurely deliberation than of breathless hurry.

The author takes as his sole, yet sufficient, clue the Greek concept of liberty, a particular and concrete historical aspect of individual freedom which finds its expression in the Polis, differing in essence from the manifestations of liberty shown at other times and in other peoples. From this point of view he surveys the development of the prehistoric Aegean world, seeing therein the substitution of the concept of federation for that of subjection, and regarding Agamemnon as the symbol of the political method of hegemony, which alone flourished in the Aegean from the twelfth to the fourth century B.C. With this he contrasts the 'Persian liberty' with its greater cohesive force, resulting in a wider and more lasting dominion than that of the Greeks, and reviews in outline the great wars of the fifth and earlier fourth centuries as showing the process by which the Greek powers were levelled, and so Greek hegemony was subordinated to Persian monarchy. The author then traces the rise of Macedon, Greek in every respect save that of her monarchical and absolute government, and the steps by which the Macedonian power, victorious over a divided Greece and a discor-

dant Persia, succumbed in turn before the might of Rome. The concluding lecture seeks to justify the choice of the concept of liberty as the criterion whereby we may best judge Greek history, the criterion which Greece herself accepted, and to show how and why that liberty proved inimical to Greek power, and ends with a criticism of the conceptions underlying the histories of Grote and of Beloch, with their insistence on individual and national liberty respectively.

The work is vigorous and interesting throughout, and although there are in it judgments which may well be questioned, every attentive reader is likely to find it stimulating and suggestive.

MARCUS N. TOD.

*Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik herausgegeben von O. NEUGEBAUER, J. STENZEL, O. TOEPLITZ. Abteilung B.: Studien, Band 1, Heft 1. Berlin: Julius Springer, 1929. RM. 12.*

WE have here the first part of the first volume of Section 'B' of a new series, which is to contain Sources ('A') and Studies ('B') for the history of mathematics. The sources are to consist of original texts with translations and all elucidations necessary for those who do not know the original language of the particular text. No parts of Section 'A' are yet to hand. The part before us contains some very interesting Old-Babylonian mathematical documents, containing remarkable calculations in sexagesimal fractions and problems leading to the equivalent of (1) simultaneous equations in algebra with several unknowns, and (2) mixed quadratic equations. But the bulk of the volume is devoted to three papers on Plato and Aristotle: (1) 'Das Verhältnis von Mathematik und Ideenlehre bei Plato,' by O. Toeplitz; (2) 'Zur Theorie des Logos bei Aristoteles,' by J. Stenzel; and (3) 'Plato's Einfluss auf die Bildung der Mathematischen Methode,' by F. Solmsen. The first two connect themselves with Stenzel's book, *Zahl und Gestalt bei Plato und Aristoteles*, and later attempts to find in the *ἀόριστος δῶς*, or 'great and small,' gropings after a system of numbers which shall include not only integers but irrationals, after the fashion of G. Cantor and Dedekind. They are hard reading, and it is difficult to carry away any very definite impression of the points made.

T. L. HEATH.

*The Roman Tribunal.* By H. D. JOHNSON. Pp. 66. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1927.

THIS is a painstaking study. Miss Johnson undertakes a twofold topographical problem—the location of the *tribunal praetorium* and of the 'Aurelian tribunal.' This she prefaces with two chapters containing 'a detailed historical study of the term tribunal' and 'a brief account of Roman court procedure.' In these chapters she has collected an immense number of references, and discussed the bearing of such as seemed important. The references are not always accurate, and one feels that Miss Johnson is more at home in pure scholarship than among

imperial 'realien' and the epigraphic material necessary to elucidate them. Footnotes 15, 21, 28, 61, and her description of the original decree, of which a *tabula honestae missionis* is the copy, as 'a memorandum of soldiers receiving official diplomata,' may illustrate the point; while the confusion between the civil and military spheres on pp. 13-14 is in marked contrast with the lucidity of the discussion of such phrases as *pro, de, in tribunali*. The second chapter deals only with the republican period, and is more satisfactory, though on p. 43 she appears to have forgotten the last paragraph of Chapter I., which indeed, perhaps because an inscription is in question, contains a serious confusion.

The position of the *tribunal praetorium*, dealt with in Chapter III., is securely fixed within narrow limits, and Miss Johnson's suggestions for its closer location are well conceived. It should be noted perhaps that the B.M. Cat., Imperial Coins, p. xcv, gives a better date (23 B.C.) for the triumvirate of Surdinus than the B.M. Cat., Republican Coins, which she quotes, and that the contemporaneity of relief and inscription on the Surdinus slab is not free from doubt. In Chapter IV., on the evidence of several passages from Cicero and [Virgil] Cat. X. 23-5, she maintains that the 'Aurelian tribunal lay on the spot later covered by the front half of the Temple of Divus Iulius.' It is certain that the tribunal was in the Forum, likely perhaps that it was towards its eastern end; but the pressure necessary to extract the proof of this from literary evidence may be illustrated by the treatment of the *Catalepton* passage. The mule-driver Sabinus *nunc eburnea Sedetque sede seque dedicat tibi Gemelle Castor et gemelle Castoris* 'looks over towards the Temple of Castor, and Castor's twin, who are apparently not far away. A tribunal in the lower Forum north of the Temple of Castor is indicated.' But to make this fit we must (1) accept Virgil's authorship; (2) identify Sabinus with Ventidius Bassus; (3) assume that he was designated praetor by Caesar at the same time as the consuls; (4) date the poem to the period February-April 44, when, according to Miss J., the tribunal was removed entirely by Dolabella. And all the while our praetor, by turning his head a little more, could look at the Temple of Castor from a distance of ninety yards from the well-authenticated tribunal of Chapter III. As Miss J. remarks, 'a poet' (and, she might have added, an orator) 'cannot be held to precise topography.' It is a pity the Forum is so small.

D. ATKINSON.

*Cicero: The Verrine Orations.* With an English translation by L. H. G. Greenwood, M.A. In two volumes. I.: *Against Caecilius, Against Verres*, Part I., Part II., Books I. and II. Pp. 504. London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam's Sons, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.

THIS is one of the good Loeb's, and indeed a very good one. The translation steers happily a middle course between literalness and freedom. The points for comment are well selected, and the notes helpful and often suggestive. The

text is based on the editions of Müller and Peterson, but shows independence of judgment. Thus it keeps *suspicionem* in C. 31, *hominum* in V. l. 48, *et qui* II. ii. 108, *erant* ii. 183. It compromises at ii. 61 with *amplam occasionem*. Disavowing an intention of making serious contributions to the improvement of the text, Mr. Greenwood nevertheless prints three conjectures of his own worth considering: *utrumque* II. i. 5, *in crimen* 110, *sic, ubi* ii. 34. At II. ii. 130 *ad fin.* he suggests xxxvi for xxxv.

H. STEWART.

*Vespasian and Some of his Contemporaries.*

By C. LONGFORD. Pp. xv+191. Frontispiece of Vespasian; a map of Palestine. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co.

THE title of this small volume indicates sufficiently its matter, though not its manner. It gives a readable and popular account of the career of Vespasian, in a rather anecdotal and Suetonian style. Some of the facts are not always quite as stated, and the translations, where they occur, are not always accurate. It is not a book for the serious student; but ordinary readers will find both interest and instruction in it.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

*Gai Institutionum Commentarii Quattuor.* Sextum editit B. KUEBLER. Pp. xxxvi+270. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928. Paper, M. 3.20 (bound, M. 4.60).

NEW editions of Gaius are called for more often than of other 'Reliquiae Iurisprudentiae Anteiustinianae.' Hence the text originally prepared by Huschke for that collection was republished separately, and has now reached a sixth separate edition. The body of the book is reprinted, with only one or two small changes, from the fifth edition; and the interest of the new issue lies in a two-page supplement at the end. This gives the papyrus fragment of Gaius found at Oxyrhynchus (*Ox. Pap.* XVII. 2103), and Levy's reconstruction. The papyrus contains parts of Book IV., §§ 57, 68-71 (also preserved in the Veronese MS.), 72 and 73 (most of which is illegible in V). It adds nothing to our knowledge of the law, since all that can be read with any certainty in the papyrus could be either read in V or supplied in substance from Justinian's Institutes. But the papyrus is attributed by Hunt to the third century; V belongs to the fifth or sixth and has been suspected of serious interpolation; and their close correspondence confirms the authority of V as an exposition of second-century law.

P. W. DUFF.

*La Titulature impériale d'Hadrien.* By LOUIS PERRET. Pp. 102. Paris: Boccard, 1929.

M. PERRET has in preparation two more extensive works on the life and principate of Hadrian; in the meantime he publishes this comprehensive study of the elements composing the official title of the Emperor, and of the epithets applied to him in various documents. The plan has disadvantages: at times there seems a ten-

dency to insist at length on the self-evident, at others we must wait for these future publications to find the reasons for views on which there is as yet no general agreement. Its advantages are that it gives free scope for discussion of some points of interest—e.g. the dates of the second Trib. Pot. and the second Salutation, though in this there are some misprints, and a confusion of statement between p. 50, n. 4, and p. 52, para. 2. The basis of classification of the titles is at times obscure. Why should the *tribunicia potestas* and the Proconsulate be called official while the Consulate is honorific? Again, special attention is given to the titles *Zētr* 'Ὀλύμπιος, Πανελλήνιος; but other similar ones—e.g. *Nēos Διώνυσος*—are at least as common; nor does it seem clear why these are classed as *cognomina*. The most interesting discussion centres round the use of the term 'Dominus.' M. Perret concludes that the use of it in the documents shows that 'Hadrien a hâté l'évolution qui conduit du principat au gouvernement souverain.' But apart from the instances from Egypt, where the title in Greek or Latin had been in use since Nero, the evidence of a meaning equivalent to that current from the time of Severus onwards is slight. Most of the examples cited admit, and some demand, another explanation. But in general the collection of material is adequate and the conclusions well founded. We look forward with interest to the publication of *P. Aelius Hadrien* and *Essai sur le Gouvernement de l'Empereur Hadrien*.

D. ATKINSON.

*Choricii Gazaei Opera.* Recensuit RICHARDUS FOERSTER†: editionem confecit Eberhardus Richtsteig. Pp. xxxvi+576. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929. R.M. 26.60 (bound, 28).

IT was the intention of the late Professor R. Foerster to bring out an edition of Choricius, and indeed he published a few works of this author not previously edited. He prepared the present edition very carefully, incorporating in it the three Declamations wrongly assigned to Libanius. He completed the text with *apparatus criticus*, and part of the illustrative notes, and in 1922 sent the work to the publisher, who put it later into Dr. Richtsteig's hands. Richtsteig introduced various corrections and supplied some omissions, and made the punctuation and orthography uniform. In particular, he added a vast number of notes, to illustrate the diction of Choricius and to show his indebtedness to previous authors. He availed himself of several dissertations and of notes in Foerster's Libanius in places where Choricius is referred to. He also made additions to the *prolegomena*, and has provided two very full indexes. Foerster's *apparatus criticus* displays the same thoroughness as that in his edition of Libanius. Richtsteig's work has been a most laborious one, and most of the illustrative notes come from his pen. We have observed one or two places where a passage might have been adduced, but Richtsteig's intimate knowledge of Libanius, to whom Choricius' obligations are paramount, make it certain that no one could have performed the task better. Choricius be-

longed to the school of Gaza, and wrote in the sixth century A.D. He was a Christian, and his Orations, which form pleasant reading, include a panegyric on Marcianus, Bishop of Gaza, and a funeral speech on Mary, mother of Marcianus and of Anastasius, Bishop of Eleutheropolis, while references to the N.T. are not uncommon. The treatment of the Orations, however, like that of the Declamations and Discourses, is secular, and follows closely the rhetorical tradition. This edition is sure to remain the standard one for very many years to come.

G. MIDDLETON.

*Procopius.* With an English translation by H. B. DEWING. (Loeb Classical Library.) Vol. IV.: pp. 490; 1 map. Vol. V.: pp. 441. London and New York: Heinemann, 1924-8. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.

PROFESSOR DEWING'S version of Procopius has now reached the fifth volume out of seven that are promised. In Vols. IV. and V. we read of the reconquest of Italy. Belisarius is the chief hero. In spite of the jealousy and open insubordination of his principal officers, he obtained command of Italy against superior Gothic forces in a remarkably short space of time. So strongly did the Goths admire him that they offered to make him king. It is perhaps idle to imagine what might have happened if this great leader had entertained dynastic ambitions, and had founded a new Empire in the West two and a half centuries even before Charlemagne. But Belisarius had notions of loyalty which forbade any such attempt.

Nobody will pretend that Procopius is a brilliant historian. He lacks feeling and dignity, and shows little appreciation of the underlying significance of the events he records. A multitude of details often obscures the main drift of the story. Yet the work is of great interest, for it tells of the last serious attempt made by the Eastern Empire to assert its authority in the West.

The present translation is to be commended as a faithful and readable version. Its style is simple, following the Greek closely throughout. This results at times in a certain commonplaceness, for which, however, the translator is not wholly responsible, since Procopius does not offer many opportunities for elevated prose. A little more freedom in handling the Greek would have rendered unnecessary a few stiff and artificial phrases, such as the following: 'Terdetes had had a falling out with Gubazes . . .' (Vol. V., pp. 141 and 145); and 'the Lazi preferred those difficulties which were not for the present moment' (Vol. V., p. 217). But these are exceptional, and the clearness and simplicity of the translation is a great merit.

A map of Northern Italy is given in Vol. IV. The reader will be grateful for this, but, like Oliver Twist, he will ask for more. A map to include the Euxine Sea, the Caucasus and Armenia, would be most helpful to illustrate the account of the renewal of the Persian War which occurs in Vol. V. The notes are interesting and for the most part adequate.

Procopius' explanation of 'sardonic' laughter (Vol. V., p. 315) might have been accompanied by a reference to Pausanias X. 17, 13. And readers will ask whether anything else is known of the 'apes just like men' whom he declares on the same page to exist in Corsica, or of the 'ship of Aeneas' which he had himself seen carefully preserved in a boat-house on the banks of the Tiber.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

GUSTAV SOYTER: *Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber und Chronisten.* Ausgewählte Texte mit Einleitung, kritischem Apparat und Kommentar = Kommentierte griechische und lateinische Texte herausgegeben von J. Geffcken, No. 5. Pp. viii+64. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1929. M. 2.50.

THIS is an excellent little book; the introduction gives to the student particulars of the principal works on the language and grammar of medieval Greek writers: the texts chosen are arranged under the headings (i.) Geschichtliche Ereignisse (ranging from A.D. 325 to A.D. 1453), (ii.) Kulturbilder, and (iii.) an appendix of Erlasse und Urkunden. The commentary on these texts occupies pp. 53-61. Indices pp. 62-64. The extracts are well chosen: it might be suggested that three selections dealing with court ceremonies are somewhat excessive: one would have welcomed, e.g., a scene from the *Vita Danielis Stylitae* and perhaps the account of a miracle from the *Acta S. Demetrii*. The passage chosen from Theophylactus Simocatta is a rather malicious selection, but it may be well for the student to know of what Theophylactus is capable in the way of preciousness of style. In a second edition, to the commentary on No. 4 (p. 6) should be added a reference to the poems of George of Pisidia on which this passage of Theophanes is based; to the notes on No. 7 (p. 9) a reference to *Byzantion* IV. (1929), pp. 13-28; to the notes on No. 4 (pp. 31-32) a reference to J. B. Bury's *Gibbon* V. 199, note; *English Historical Review* XIII. (1898), 340; *History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, pp. 81-83, and the index to that book s.v. *Bride-shows*. Professor Soyter has done his work well, and it is to be hoped that this little book will be widely used.

N. H. BAYNES.

*Anna Comnena.* A study by GEORGINA BUCKLER. Pp. x+558. Oxford University Press, 1929. 25s.

THE newly-awakened interest in the history of the Eastern Empire is strikingly illustrated by the almost simultaneous appearance of three books dealing with Anna Comnena, the daughter of that Alexius Comnenus whose appeal to the West called into being the First Crusade. The translation of the *Alexiad* by Dr. Elizabeth Dawes, a life of Anna in the Representative Women series by Mrs. Naomi Mitchison, and, finally, this large work by Mrs. Buckler, represent a remarkable modern tribute to this twelfth-century princess. Mrs. Buckler's main source has naturally been the *Alexiad*, but the other authorities, original and secondary, are plenti-



fully employed as well, and it is possible from her book to learn all that is to be known about Anna Comnena, and a great deal besides about contemporary life, thought, and government. There is plenty here to astonish those who know of medieval life only in the West, and the learning and literary achievement of the heroine will doubtless come as the greatest surprise of all. After the introduction, which epitomises the *Alexiad*, the book is divided into five parts, dealing with the personality and character of Anna, with education, and with her position as historian and writer. The general arrangement leaves much to be desired, especially that part which bears the heading 'Anna as a Character' which is divided into sections treating of the three theological and four cardinal virtues. This rather fantastic device fails equally to explain the medieval, and to enlighten the modern, mind. However, Mrs. Buckler has supplied a positive mine of information, a source-book perhaps rather than a true history, but one from which the curious can extract for themselves a fairly complete picture of Byzantine society in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and realise how far inferior to it, in culture, in ideas, in political and military science, was the contemporary civilisation of the West.

Z. N. BROOKE.

*De Ablativo Absoluto Quaestiones*. Scripsit EDWIN FLINCK-LINKOMIES. (*Ann. Acad. Scient. Fennicae, Ser. B*, tom. XX., No. 1.) Pp. 272. Helsingforsiae, 1929.

THIS is the best and fullest account of this interesting construction known to me. After summing up the opinions held about it by earlier scholars, Flinck-Linkomies discusses the following points: the date when the idiom took its rise, when and how Latin participles received a verbal force, the Plautine and Terentian use of this idiom with persons, the use by the same authors of the abl. absol. of things, the abl. absol. in authors of the Republican period down to and including Cicero, the use of substantives in the abl. absol. after Cicero, abl. absol. of adjectives, of present participles, and of perfect participles. The author has a grasp of historical method in the study of grammatical problems, and writes in a clear Latin style. The only criticism one would offer is that, in spite of his wide acquaintance with the bibliography of his subject, he has not cast his net as wide as is desirable, and certain idioms prevalent in the later Latin are in consequence ignored. English scholars will note with surprise the absence of Roby's name, and the American scholar R. B. Steele (p. 206) should be added to the list of modern authors quoted. The book is well indexed. A. SOUTER.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK).

(1929.)

ARCHAEOLOGY.—November 11. T. Frank, *Roman Buildings of the Republic* [Papers and Monographs of the American School in Rome, Vol. III, 1924] (H. W. Wright). Long review, favourable. F. has won valuable results, some of them revolutionary, as to the date of buildings from investigations of the materials used.

HISTORY.—December 9. B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century*. [Harvard University Press, 1928] (A. B. West). A convincing reconstruction, long despaired of, of *I.G.* 1<sup>2</sup>. 324, which records loans from temple-treasures from 426-5 to 423-2 B.C.: this leads to epoch-making discoveries as to the 'senatorial' and 'lunar' calendars. W. discusses at length several points of detail.—December 16. E. Bevan, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* [London: Methuen, 1927] (C. J. Kraemer). A re-writing of Mahaffy's work. Praised, but K. complains of lack of a good map and of inadequate description of the illustrations.

LITERATURE.—November 18. J. Wight Duff, *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age: From Tiberius to Hadrian* [New York: Scribner, 1927] (J. Hammer). Long review, favourable.—M. M. Gillies, *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, Book III*. [Cambridge Press, 1928] (J. Hammer). Specially praised

for its introduction.—December 2. F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages* [Oxford University Press, 1927] (J. Hammer). Praised.—December 16. J. Geffcken, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte. Band I. Von den Anfängen bis auf die Sophistenseit* [Heidelberg: Winter, 1926] (J. Hammer). A fine accomplishment: but the author refers but little to modern works not written in German.—W. Rhys Roberts, *Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism* [In 'Our Debt to Greece and Rome': New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928] (La R. Van Hook). A task admirably done; but v. H. criticises R.'s arrangement of his material.

[The issue of November 11 contains a list of classical articles in non-classical periodicals.]

### PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JULY-DECEMBER, 1929.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—H. v. Arnim, *Eudemische Ethik und Metaphysik*. Sitzungsbd. d. Ak. d. Wiss. in Wien, Bd. 207, 5 [Vienna, 1928] (Gohlke). Main result that Eudem. Ethics come between earlier and later stratum of Metaphysics will be generally accepted.—*Joannis Sardiiani Commentarium in Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, edidit H. Rabe. *Rhetores Graeci*, Vol. XV. [Leipzig, 1928, Teubner. Pp. xxxvi + 306] (Ammon). Ex-

emplary first edition of this recently discovered commentary.—*Isocrates De Pace et Philippiis*. Edited with a Historical Introduction and Commentary by M. L. W. Laistner. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXII. [New York, 1927, Longmans, Green and Co. Pp. 173] (Ammon). Clear and critical introduction serves its purpose well; reliable commentary. An attractive edition.—*Die Werke Philos von Alexandria*. Fünfter Teil. Herausg. v. I. Heinemann [Breslau, 1929, M. and H. Marcus. Pp. viii+294] (Stählin). Valuable help towards understanding of many difficulties in Philo. But reviewer has a long list of corrections.—L. Castiglioni, *Stile e testo del romanzo pastorale di Longo*. Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere. Rendiconti, Vol. LXI., Fasc. I.-V., 1928, pp. 203-223 (Zimmermann). Long and favourable discussion. Reviewer does not always agree with C. on textual points, but he gratefully acknowledges the value of his stimulating investigation.

LATIN LITERATURE.—*Plautus Rudens*. Text und Commentar von F. Marx. Abh. d. Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Bd. XXXVIII., Nr. V. [Leipzig, 1928, Hirzel. Pp. 322] (Klotz). M. has all the necessary qualifications for making this a really helpful edition. It is not too much to say that we have no commentary on this scale for any of Plautus' plays. Highly praised.—*Cicéron, Des termes extrêmes des biens et des maux*. Tome I. Texte ét. et trad. par J. Martha.—*Cicéron, De l'amitié*. Texte ét. et trad. par L. Laurand.—*Cicéron, De l'orateur*. Livre II. Texte ét. et trad. par E. Courbaud [Paris, 1928, 1928, and 1927, Association G. Budé] (Philippson). All very favourably reviewed. Laurand's volume is described as the most scientific.—*P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri VI*. Rec. C. Landi. Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum No. 51 [Turin, 1928, Paravia and Co. Pp. xliii+236] (Levy). Successful edition; conservative text.—*Palladii Rutilii Tauri Aemiliani viri illustris opus agriculturae. Liber quartus decimus de veterinaria medicina*. Ed. J. Svennung [Göteborg, 1926, Eranos' Förlag. Pp. xxvi+94] (Becher). Valuable addition to this Swedish series.—D. Tardi, *Fortunat. Étude sur un dernier représentant de la poésie latine dans la Gaule mérovingienne* [Paris, 1927, Bovin and Co. Pp. xvi+288] (Manitius). Thorough and systematic study, dealing with F.'s intellectual and political environment, his poetry, and his language. No index.—C. Bosch, *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Literatur der historischen Exempla* [Stuttgart, 1929, Kohlhammer. Pp. 114] (Klotz). Widens our knowledge of Latin collections of exempla, but is not final for Valerius Maximus and his method.—*Tacitus. De vita Julii Agricolaë et De Germania*. With Introduction, Notes, Appendices and Index. Revised edition by A. Gudeman [Boston, 1927, Allyn and Bacon. Pp. xii+409] (Ammon). This revised edition is a new book. Critically revised text; amazingly copious, clear, and reliable commentary; above all

an exhaustive treatment of T.'s language and style. Highly praised.—T. Maccio Plauto, *La Mostellaria: introd., testo critico, e commento* per cura di N. Terzaghi [Turin, 1929, Paravia and Co. Pp. xl+240] (Klotz). Metrically unsatisfactory, but commentary contains useful matter.—J. Hörle, *Catos Hausbücher. Analyse seiner Schrift 'De agricultura' nebst Wiederherstellung seines Kelterhauses und Gutshofes* [Paderborn, 1929, Schöningh. Pp. vi+270, with 12 illustrations from author's drawings] (Becher). Penetrating and fruitful study. But reviewer doubts if H. will carry all his readers with him the whole way.

HISTORY.—E. Rotherts *Karten und Skizzen aus der Geschichte des Altertums*. Nach der letzten (achten) Auflage völlig umgearbeitet und neu herausg. von E. Niepmann [Düsseldorf, 1927, Bagel. Pp. v, and 19+24 maps with explanatory text] (Enzlin). Real advance on previous editions. Exceedingly helpful.—W. Siegfried, *Studien zur geschichtlichen Anschauung des Polybios* [Leipzig, 1928, Teubner] (Laqueur). Though reviewer cannot agree with views propounded, he welcomes the book as based on trustworthy foundation and having something new to say.—W. Kubitschek, *Grundriss der antiken Zeitrechnung*. Handb. d. Altertumswiss., begr. v. I. von Müller, neu herausg. v. W. Otto. Abt. I., Teil 7 [Munich, 1928, Beck. Pp. ix+241] (Oppermann). Replaces Ungers 'Zeitrechnung der Griechen und Römer' in this series. Shows penetrating mastery of material and profound learning; but the exposition and arrangement leave much to be desired.—E. Ziebarth, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Seeraubs und Seehandels im alten Griechenland* [Hamburg, 1929, Friedrichsen, De Gruyter and Co. Pp. ii+148] (Heichelheim). Though in reviewer's opinion Z.'s argument is not always correct, his book with its copious contents is a real contribution to knowledge.

PHILOSOPHY.—I. Heinemann, *Poseidonios' metaphysische Schriften*. Bd. II. [Breslau, 1928, M. and H. Marcus. Pp. viii+496] (Leisegang). Pattern of clean and exact scholarship that has become rare nowadays.—R. Walzer, *Magna Moralia und aristotelische Ethik*. Neue philolog. Untersuch., Heft 7 [Berlin, 1929, Weidmann. Pp. 300] (Gohlke). Reviewer shows how W.'s arguments actually support the authenticity of A.'s *Magna Moralia*, though his intention is to prove the reverse.

LANGUAGE, LEXICOGRAPHY, METRIC.—H. Krahe, *Lexikon altillyrischer Personennamen* [Heidelberg, 1929, Winter. Pp. viii+174] (E. Hermann). Useful collection, but must be used with caution. Reviewer calls attention to weaknesses due to superficial and mechanical method.—*Suidae Lexikon. Pars I*. Ed. A. Adler [Leipzig, 1928, Teubner. Pp. xxx+549] (Tolkien). Very considerable achievement. But does not make Bernhardt's edition of 1853 superfluous.—F. Crusius, *Römische Metrik. Eine Einführung* [Munich, 1929, Hueber. Pp. vi+263] (Klotz). Clear and intelligible; an excellent introduction

which meets a much-felt need.—U. Pohle, *Die Sprache des Redners Hyperides in ihren Beziehungen zur Koine* [Leipzig, 1928, Harrassowitz. Pp. 140] (Ammon). Systematic and clear. Adds considerably to our knowledge of H.'s language, and is also valuable for history of Greek.—E. Fiesel, *Namen des griechischen Mythos im Etruskischen*. Ergänzungsheft z. Ztschr. f. vgl. Sprachf. Nr. 5. [Göttingen, 1928, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. Pp. iv + 136] (E. Hermann). Shows that not all Greek myths came to Etruscans through Greeks, but that some names were known to them before their contact with Greeks. Adds also considerably to our knowledge of Etruscan phonology.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—A. Schulten, *Numantia. Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 1905-1912*.

*Bd. IV. Die Lager von Renieblas* [Munich, 1929, Bruckmann. Pp. xx + 309, with 89 plates, 2 maps, and 32 plans] (Grosse). Vol. IV. contains sections on the different camps and on the finds (metals, coins, pottery). Immense quantity of material. Not merely industrious, but scientific work that provides a firm foundation for our knowledge of an important epoch of the Mediterranean peoples.—H. Holdt [H. von Hofmannsthal, *Griechenland: Baukunst, Landschaft, Volksleben*. In erweiterter Form herausg. und mit Erläuterungen versehen von H. T. Bossert [Berlin, Wasmuth. Pp. xxi, with one sketch map and 304 illustrations] (Poland). Very much enlarged edition. The illustrations alone have grown from 176 to 304. Warmly recommended.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\*.\* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Adler (M.) *Studien zu Philon von Alexandria*. Pp. 102. Breslau: Marcus, 1929. Paper, 6 M.

Alford (M.) *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, Book II. Edited by M. A. Pp. xxix + 271. London: Macmillan, 1929. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

Aly (W.) *Formprobleme der frühen griechischen Prosa*. Pp. 182. (Philologus, Supplementband XXI, Heft III.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1929. Paper, M. 12; bound, M. 14.

Ashmole (B.) *A Catalogue of the Ancient Marbles at Ince Blundell Hall*. Pp. xvi + 139; 51 pp. of plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1929. Cloth, 84s. net.

Boulanger (A.) *Cicéron. Discours, Tome VII. Pour M. Fonteius, Pour A. Cécina, Sur les Pouvoirs de Pompée*. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 20 fr.

Brecht (F. J.) *Platon und der George-Kreis*. Pp. xi + 84. (Das Erbe der Alten. Zweite Reihe XVII.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1929. Paper, RM. 4 (bound, 5.50).

Breuning (P. S.) *De hymnorum Homericorum memoria*. Pp. 130; 3 photographs of MSS. Utrecht: Oosthoek, 1929. Paper.

British Museum. Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities. *A Guide to the Exhibition illustrating Greek and Roman Life*. Third edition. Pp. viii + 238; 248 illustrations. London, 1929. Cloth and boards, 2s.

Bury (R. G.) *Plato, with an English translation*. VII. Timaeus, Critias, Cleitophon, Menexenus, Epistles. Pp. 636; 3 illustrations. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1929. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

Conway (R. S.) *Great Writers of Rome*. Pp. 80. (Benn's Sixpenny Library, No. 98.) London: Benn, 1930. Paper, 6d. net.

de Bouard (A.) *Manuel de Diplomatique française et pontificale. Diplomatique générale*. Pp. 397, avec un album de 54 planches en phototypie. Paris: Auguste Picard, 1929.

Eijkman (J. C. B.) *Bijdrage tot de Kennis der Grieksche Toponymie*. Pp. 96. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1929. Paper.

Fiske (G. C.) *Cicero's De Oratore and Horace's Ars Poetica*. Pp. 152. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 27.) Madison, 1929. Cloth.

Forster (E. S.) and Rolfe (J. C.) *Lucius Annaeus Florus, Epitome of Roman History; with an English translation by E. S. F. Cornelius Nepos, with an E. t. by J. C. R.* (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xv + 744. London: Heinemann, 1929. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

Foster (B. O.) *Livy, with an English translation*. V. Books XXI-XXII. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xx + 413; 7 maps and plans. London: Heinemann, 1929. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

Friess (O.) *Beobachtungen über die Darstellungskunst Catulls*, Pp. 98. Würzburg: Memminger, 1929. Paper.

Goets (G.) *M. Terenti Varronis Rerum Rusticarum Libri Tres. Post Henricum Keil iterum edidit G. G. Editio nova correctior*. Pp. xxiv + 162. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929. Cloth, RM. 5.60 (unbound, 4.60).

Heiberg (J. L.) *Fra Hellas og Italien. Udvælgte Afhandlinger*. 2 vols. Pp. xi + 496 + 420. Copenhagen: Jespersen og Pios Forlag. Paper.

Honours Classics in the University of Toronto. By a group of classical graduates. With a foreword by Sir R. Falconer. Pp. 83; portrait. University of Toronto Press, 1929. Cloth.

- Jones* (P. F.) A Concordance to the Historia Ecclesiastica of Bede. Pp. ix+585. (The Mediaeval Academy of America, Publication No. 2.) Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1929. Paper, \$6.50.
- Juret* (A. C.) La Phonétique latine. Pp. 69. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 8 fr.
- Klibansky* (R.) Ein Proklos-Fund und seine Bedeutung. Pp. 41. (Sitzungsb. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1928/29. 5. Abhandlung.) Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1929. Paper, 2.40 Mk.
- Kowalski* (J.) De Didone Graeca et Latina. Pp. 50. (Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego. T. LXIII, nr 1.) Cracow etc.: Gebethner and Wolff, 1929. Paper.
- Laurand* (L.) Manuel des Études grecques et latines. Fascicule VII: Métrique, Sciences complémentaires. 4<sup>e</sup> édition, revue et corrigée. Pp. 749-883. Paper. Appendices II-IV. Pp. 53-123. Paper. Appendice V. Petit atlas pratique d'histoire grecque et romaine. Pp. 127-205. Cloth. Paris: Picard, 1929.
- Lawler* (L. B.) Easy Latin Plays. Pp. xvi+143; 9 figures. New York: Macmillan Co. (London: Macmillan), 1929. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Marshall* (F. H.) Three Cretan Plays. Translated from the Greek by F. H. M. With an introduction by J. Mavrogordato. Pp. vii+338. London: Milford, 1929. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Mosley* (J. H.) Ovid: The Art of Love, and other poems, with an English translation. (De Medicamine Faciei, Artis Amatoriae I-III, Remedium Amoris, Nux, Ibis, Halieuticon, Consolatio ad Liviam, Appendix to Ibis.) Pp. xiv+382. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1929. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Müller* (H. F.) A Chronology of Vulgar Latin. Pp. ix+172. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, Heft 78.) Halle (Saale): Niemeyer, 1929. Paper, M. 12.50.
- Neue Wege zur Antike*, VIII. Platon im Gymnasium, von W. Kranz; Sophocles: Aias und Antigone, von W. Schadewaldt; Neue Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der griechischen Metrik, von A. Körte; etc. Pp. 117. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Paper, RM. 5.
- Post* (L. A.) Menander. Three Plays. The Girl from Samos; The Arbitration; The Shearing of Glycera. Translated and Interpreted. Pp. viii+128. (Broadway Translations.) London: Routledge. Cloth and velum, 7s. 6d. net.
- Robin* (L.) Platon. Tome IV, 2<sup>e</sup> partie. Le Banquet. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 25 fr.
- Robson* (E. I.) Arrian, with an English translation. Anabasis Alexandri, Books I-IV. Pp. xvi+450. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1929. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Rocco* (G. A.) Carmi latini editi ed inediti, scelti e pubblicati con un saggio introduttivo su l'autore a cura di N. Coppola e con prefazione del Prof. N. Festa. Pp. lvi+372. Milan etc.: Società Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1929. Paper, L. 25.
- Ross* (W. D.) and *Fobes* (F. H.) Theophrastus, Metaphysics. With translation, commentary and introduction. Pp. xxxii+87. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1929. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Schmid* (W.) Untersuchungen zum Gefesselten Prometheus. Pp. 116. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 9. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1929. Paper, RM. 7.50.
- Smith* (H. R. W.) New Aspects of the Menon Painter. (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology. Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 1-64, plates 1-6, 9 figures in text.) Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1929. Paper, \$80.
- Souilhé* (J.) et *Cruchon* (G.) Aristote: L'Ethique Nicomachéenne, Livres I et II; Traduction et commentaire. Pp. 249. (Archives de Philosophie, Volume VII, Cahier I.) Paris: Beauchesne, 1929. Paper.
- Starwell* (F. M.) Euripides: Iphigenia in Aulis. Translated into English verse by F. M. S., with a Preface by G. Murray. Pp. viii+128. London: G. Bell, 1929. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Sterbins* (E. B.) The Dolphin in the Literature and Art of Greece and Rome. Pp. 136. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co., 1929. Paper, 6s. 6d. (cloth, 10s. 6d.).
- Troels-Lund* Himmelsbild und Weltanschauung im Wandel der Zeiten. Autorisierte vom Verfasser durchgesehene Uebersetzung von L. Bloch. 5. Auflage. Pp. v+276. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Cloth, RM. 8.
- Villeneuve* (F.) Horace. Tome I. Odes et Épodes. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 35 fr.
- Waltzing* (J.-P.) Tertullien. Apologetique. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 20 fr.
- Walzel* (O.) Handbuch der Literatur-Wissenschaft. Lieferungen 113, 127. Kappelmacher, Römische Literatur, Hefte 5, 6. Pp. 129-192; illustrations. Wildpark-Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion. Paper.
- Weber* (L.) Euripides Alcester. Erklärt von L. W. Pp. v+168. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Cloth, RM. 10 (unbound, 8).
- Wicksteed* (P. H.) and *Cornford* (F. M.) Aristotle, The Physics; with an English translation. In two volumes. I. Pp. xc+427. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1929. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Woolley* (C. L.) Ur of the Chaldees. A record of seven years of excavation. Pp. 210; XVI plates, 2 maps. London: Ernest Benn, 1929. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Wright* (F. A.) The Love Poems of Joannes Secundus. A Revised Latin Text and an English Verse Translation, together with an Introductory Essay on the Latin Poetry of the Renaissance. Pp. 253. London: Routledge, 1930. Cloth, 15s. net.



con pre-  
lvi + 372.  
Alighieri,

ophrastus,  
mmentary  
Oxford :  
rd), 1929.

efesselten  
Beiträge  
) Stutt-  
RM. 7.50.  
ne Menon  
Publica-  
. I, No. 1,  
) Berke-  
nia Press,

L'Ethique  
raduction  
hives de  
) Paris :

a in Aulis.  
F. M. S.,  
viii + 128.  
6d. net.  
Literature  
Pp. 136.  
Publish-  
ros. 6d.).  
schauung  
erte vom  
ung von  
Leipzig  
RM. 8.  
Odes et  
Collection  
is: 'Les

ogétique.  
des Uni-  
s Belles

-Wissen-  
elmacher,  
129-192;  
Akade-  
n. Paper.  
klärt von  
Berlin :  
ound, 8).  
(F. M.)  
English  
Pp. xc+  
London :  
(leather,

A record  
to; XVI  
nn, 1929.

Joannes  
and an  
with an  
Poetry of  
n: Rout-

MAY 29 1936